



## DOCTOR OF EDUCATION (EDD)

### How And Why Universal Primary Education Was Selected As A Millennium Development Goal: A Case Study

Maher, Edmond

*Award date:*  
2016

*Awarding institution:*  
University of Bath

[Link to publication](#)

### Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:  
[openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk)

Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. Access is subject to the above licence, if given. If no licence is specified above, original content in this thesis is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) Licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Any third-party copyright material present remains the property of its respective owner(s) and is licensed under its existing terms.

#### Take down policy

If you consider content within Bath's Research Portal to be in breach of UK law, please contact: [openaccess@bath.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@bath.ac.uk) with the details. Your claim will be investigated and, where appropriate, the item will be removed from public view as soon as possible.

*HOW AND WHY* UNIVERSAL PRIMARY EDUCATION WAS  
SELECTED AS A MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOAL:  
A CASE STUDY

Edmond Anthony Maher

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Education

University of Bath  
Department of Education

October 2015

Copyright

Attention is drawn to the fact that copyright of this thesis rests with its author. A copy of the thesis has been supplied on condition that anyone who consults it is understood to recognize that its copyright rests with the author and that they must not copy it or use material from it except as permitted by law or with the consent of the author.

Signature

---

# Contents

Abstract	4
Acknowledgements	5
List of tables	6
List of abbreviations	7
List of main policy texts	8
List of influential policy actors and organisations	9
List of interviewees	12
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2. Theoretical perspectives</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Rational synoptic theory	21
2.2 Critical theory	26
2.3 World society theory	36
<b>3. Method</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1 Ontology and epistemology	45
3.2 The case study method	46
3.3 Defining and bounding the case study	47
3.4 Data collection	49
3.5 Coding	52
3.6 Data analysis and findings	53
3.7 Validity, triangulation and reliability	55

3.8 Implications for theory	58
3.9 Presenting the results	59
3.10 Ethical considerations	59
<b>4. Findings</b>	<b>61</b>
4.1 Global challenges and opportunities	64
4.2 Strengthening the UN	67
4.3 Accepted with remarkable consensus	68
4.4 A complex and opaque policy process	74
4.5 Elite policy actors and the <i>Road Map Annex</i>	79
4.6 World opinion? The absence of developing country and educator voices	86
4.7 The economic side- addressing poverty in the existing global hegemony	91
4.8 An effective strategy	99
<b>5: Hypotheses evaluation and implications for theory</b>	<b>102</b>
5.1 Hypothesis one- rational synoptic theory	102
5.2 Hypothesis two- critical theory	107
5.3 Hypothesis three- world society theory	113
5.4 Advantages of the theoretical dialogue	117
5.5 A new theory	118
<b>6: Conclusion</b>	<b>120</b>
6.1 Evaluation of hypotheses and theories	121
6.2 Strengths of this case study	122

6.3 Weaknesses of this case study	125
6.4 Researcher positioning and three theories	128
6.5 Policy process implications	129
6.6 Conclusions and implications for education literature	131
6.7 Further research called for	133
6.8 Final remarks	135
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>137</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>152</b>
Appendix 1: Critical discourse analysis	153
Appendix 2: Tracking priorities chart	174
Appendix 3: Tracking MDG priorities	205
Appendix 4: List of 1990's summits, agreements, texts	215
Appendix 5: Letter Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser to Secretary General	216
Appendix 6: General Assembly debate regarding <i>Road Map Annex</i>	219
Appendix 7: Justification of indicator ratings	227
Appendix 8: Key ethical issues encountered in the study	235

## Abstract

Between 2000 and 2015 the Millennium Development Goals were the focus of much global attention and activity. They were selected in light of astounding poverty, with over 1 billion people at the time living on less than \$1 per day. In a sense the MDGs were morally undeniable.

The focus of this study is MDG2, universal primary education. It sets out to establish *how* and *why* MDG2 came to be selected. Whilst its selection seems obvious, for years developing countries complained about the short-sightedness of prioritising primary over secondary and tertiary education (Klees 2008). A task force commissioned by the World Bank and UNESCO at the time showed that the Bank's rate of return analysis on primary education was flawed. It argued that developing countries need highly educated people to be economic and social entrepreneurs, develop good governance, strong institutions and infrastructure. In this way MDG2's selection is problematic.

Using case study method, first the literature is examined. Three hypotheses are generated: one based on a rational synoptic theory, one on critical theory and one on world society theory. A range of data are used to establish findings and test hypotheses. The study then considers implications of the findings for theory and the policy process.

The findings show that priorities promoting more equal opportunities, such as MDG2, were gradually preferred. Whereas priorities promoting more equal outcomes, such as elimination of trade barriers, were gradually excluded. The study finds no evidence that the General Assembly ever voted on the list of 8 MDGs. Rather, the MDGs were selected by elite policy actors, addressing multiple interests. The study considers the assertion that marginalization of the poor does not happen because people harbor ill will toward them, rather because "The poor have no friends among the global elite" (Pogge 2011, p. 62).

## **Acknowledgements**

Thank you:

To supervisor Manuel Souto-Otero, for skilful guidance, challenge and encouragement. To second supervisor Hugh Lauder, for the right input at the right time. To teaching and administrative staff at the University of Bath, for inspiration and encouragement. To Caroline Van Dingenen, for constructive feedback on an early draft and exceptional support and our children Hanne, Nell and Finn, for reminding me of the original motivations for the study. To interviewees, for their time, generosity, openness and feedback on a draft version. To the Board of D Y Patil International School, Belgium, for financial support of course fees, without exerting control on the research focus. To Elizabeth Meagher, for advice on writing style and grammar. To examiners Lizzie Milligan and Simon McGrath, for sharp analysis and critical engagement with this study.

Dedicated to those who help us see poverty as injustice.

## List of tables

Table 2.1: <i>Indicators</i> used to assess the rational synoptic theory hypothesis	26
Table 2.2: <i>Indicators</i> used to assess the critical theory hypothesis	35
Table 2.3: <i>Indicators</i> used to assess the world society theory hypothesis	43
Table 4.1: Brief summary of key events and identification of policy texts	61
Table 4.2: Overview of educational priorities expressed in policy texts	72
Table 4.3: Number of identified goals/targets (priorities) per policy text	76
Table 5.1: <i>Indicators</i> supporting rational synoptic theory hypothesis	102
Table 5.2: <i>Indicators</i> supporting critical theory hypothesis	107
Table 5.3: <i>Indicators</i> supporting world society theory hypothesis	113



## List of abbreviations

ECOSOC	Economic and Social Council
EFA	Education for All
G-1	Colloquial reference to the USA as the most powerful UN policy actor at the time
G-8	A forum of leading developed countries including Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, United Kingdom, United States and the European Union
G-77	The Group of 77 which is a loose knit group of nations representing the views of developing nations
IDGs	International Development Goals
IFIs	International Financial Institutions- including the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MDG2	Millennium Development Goal 2
NGOs	Non- Governmental Organisations
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OECD DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development- Development Assistance Committee
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNMD	United Nations Millennium Declaration
WTO	World Trade Organisation

## List of main policy texts

Year	Name used in this study	Proper Name	Author
1996	<i>Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i>	<i>Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: the contribution of development cooperation.</i>	OECD DAC
2000	<i>We The Peoples</i>	<i>We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.</i>	Annan, K., Secretary-General of the United Nations
2000	<i>A Better World for All</i>	<i>A better world for all: progress toward the international development goals.</i>	Annan, K., UN Secretary-General; Johnston D., OECD Secretary-General; Köhler, H., IMF Managing Director; Wolfensohn J., President of the World Bank Group.
2000	<i>Millennium Declaration</i>	<i>United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/RES/55/2).</i>	UN General Assembly
2001	<i>Road Map</i>	<i>Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/56/326).</i>	UN Secretary General
2001	<i>Road Map Annex</i>	<i>Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/56/326). Annex: Millennium Development Goals.</i>	Group of 50+ policy actors, multilateral agencies, organisations.
2005	<i>Investing in Development</i>	<i>Investing in Development: A practical plan to achieving the millennium development goals.</i>	UN Millennium Project

## List of influential policy actors and organisations

Organisation / person	Mission / role
Annan, Kofi	UN Secretary General 1997-2006. Advocate of global development goals and UN reform. Widely credited as the driving force behind the MDGs.
Doyle, Michael	Assistant UN Secretary General 2001- 2003. Commissioned by Kofi Annan to be key author of the <i>Road Map</i> . Led the process of developing the <i>Road Map Annex</i> with Jan Vandemoortele.
Fréchette, Louise	Deputy Secretary General 1997-2006. Worked with John Ruggie on draft <i>Millennium Declaration</i> . Driving force with Kofi Annan on UN reform.
G-1	Colloquial reference to the USA.
G-77	Loose knit group representing views of developing nations.
Grant, James (Jim)	Executive Director of UNICEF 1980-1995. Successfully convinced World Bank to get on board with child development goals. This paved the way for Jomtien (1990).
International Monetary Fund (IMF)	“An organization of 188 countries, working to foster global monetary cooperation, secure financial stability, facilitate international trade, promote high employment and sustainable economic growth, and reduce poverty around the world” (IMF 2015). Directly involved in MDG decision making and highly influential.
Non- Governmental Organisations (NGOs)	A wide range of organisations. In relation to this study NGOs have an increasingly prominent role in the UN. At the time of the Millennium Summit (2000) they participated in parallel gatherings to exert moral and ethical pressure on world leaders (Tony).
Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. Made up of 34 member countries, mostly developed/ richer countries from the ‘North’ (OECD 2015).

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development- Development Assistance Committee (OECD DAC)	Development Assistance Committee of the OECD. Directly involved in MDG decision making and highly influential.
Ruggie, John	Assistant UN Secretary General for Strategic Planning 1997-2001. Main author of the draft <i>Millennium Declaration</i> , synthesising UN agreements of the 1990's.
The World Bank	A “source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world... not a bank in the ordinary sense but a unique partnership to reduce poverty and support development” (World Bank 2015). Directly involved in MDG decision making and highly influential.
United Nations (UN)	Intergovernmental organisation with 193 member states for promotion of peace and confronting global challenges (UN 2015b). The term UN can be taken to mean a gathering of nation states, the UN Secretariat or more broadly the UN family including various bodies and organisations.
United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF)	Works for a more equitable world by fighting for the rights of children (UNICEF 2015). Was at the table with group of elite policy actors who determined the <i>Road Map Annex</i> , containing 8 MDGs.
United Nations Development Programme	Helps achieve poverty eradication, reduction of inequalities and exclusion, policy development, leadership skills, partnering abilities, institutional capabilities and resilience to sustain development (UNDP 2015). Was at the table with group of elite policy actors who determined the <i>Road Map Annex</i> .

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO)	<p>Strives to build networks among nations that enable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobilizing for education</li> <li>• Building intercultural understanding</li> <li>• Pursuing scientific cooperation</li> <li>• Protecting freedom of expression (UNESCO 2015a)</li> </ul> <p>UNESCO was influential in the Education For All agenda but not at the table for determining the 8 MDGs.</p>
United Nations General Assembly	The main deliberative and policy-making body of the UN, with 193 member states (UN 2015b).
UN Secretariat	The United Nations executive body (organ). Was the policy process controller for the MDGs.
Vandemoortele, Jan	<p>Chief of Social Policy at UNICEF between 1995 and 2001.</p> <p>Director of the Poverty Group at UNDP in New York from 2001-05. Co-led the group who determined the MDGs (Diplomacy Belgium 2015) along with Michael Doyle.</p>
World Trade Organisation (WTO)	“Global international organization dealing with the rules of trade between nations” (WTO 2015).

## List of interviewees

Assigned name	Role	Method
Luca	Development professional. Instrumental role in MDG selection, inner circle <i>Road Map</i> and <i>Road Map Annex</i> .	Interview
Paul	Development professional and academic. Instrumental role in MDG selection, inner circle <i>Road Map</i> and <i>Road Map Annex</i> .	Interview
Hayley	Development professional. Instrumental role in MDG selection, inner circle <i>Millennium Declaration</i> and International Development Goals (IDGs).	Interview
Leopoldo	Development professional and academic. Instrumental role in <i>Millennium Declaration</i> and International Development Goals (IDGs)	Email exchange
Giancarlo	Development professional and academic. Instrumental role UN agencies. Advocate of universal primary education.	Interview
Tim	Development professional and academic. Instrumental role UN agencies. Advocate of universal primary education.	Interview
Max	Development professional and academic. Instrumental role in Education For All and various agencies.	Interview
Tony	Development professional and academic. Connection with UN University and Millennium Project (Not the same as UN Millennium Project post 2001).	Interview
Claudia	Educational activist, author and member of various high-level education governance bodies.	Interview
Monica	Development professional and academic. Policy research using complexity and related theories to examine multilateral agency policy processes.	Interview

# 1.Introduction

In the Year 2000 world leaders gathered at the United Nations Headquarters for the Millennium Summit. At this summit they adopted the *United Nations Millennium Declaration* containing over 75 priorities, through which member states, undertook “To realize our universal aspirations for peace, cooperation and development” (p. 9). Over time those 75 priorities were reduced to a list of eight Millennium Development Goals, with associated targets. The second of these, Millennium Development Goal 2, resolved “To ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling” (UN Secretary General 2001, p.56). This research attempts to establish *how* and *why* universal primary education came to be selected as a policy priority from among those original priorities.

The UN Millennium Development Goals were part of a strategy to combat astounding poverty, with over 1 billion living on less than \$1 per day at the time (Annan 2012). According to Pogge between the end of the Cold War and 2010 over 360 million have died from hunger and remediable diseases. This is more than “Perished from wars, civil wars, and government repression over the entire twentieth century” (2010, p. 11). The *Millennium Development Goals Report 2015* puts the figure of those currently living on less \$1.25 per day at 836 million (United Nations 2015c). So in one sense, the selection of MDGs and universal primary education are unproblematic because they were addressing astounding poverty. According to Kofi Annan they were “clear, simple, and morally undeniable goals” (Annan 2012, p. 223).

Also the global distribution of wealth shows enormous disparities between the global rich and the global poor (Piketty 2014). For Piketty “It is long since past the time when we should have put the question of equality back at the centre of economic analysis... For far too long economists have neglected the distribution of wealth” (2014, p. 16). This situation did not arise only out of forces beyond our control. Rather we created this situation and we perpetuate it. Generating solutions to it is complex. When one set of priorities is selected, others are left aside. The particular combination of MDG

priorities established a global policy architecture, making some outcomes more likely and others less likely. Linked to this is Ilcan's view that "processes of globalization associated with specific global governing organizations, such as the United Nations... have received scant, critical sociological attention" (2006, p. 852). Therefore what may appear to be transparent decision-making processes by an objective organisation such as the UN in fact have an inherent bias and are subject to the priorities of various interest groups. In this way the selection of the MDGs is also subject to those interests and is problematic.

Likewise, in education, King states "It is perhaps surprising how little analysis there has been of exactly how this global education architecture was constructed... In particular, the role of multilateral bodies in advancing this agenda has been little researched" (2007, p. 378). Unterhalter (2014) raises a similar point, stating "As yet there is no historical account of the diplomatic and organizational processes that resulted in the narrowing of the EfA and Dakar agendas to the MDG framework on education" (p. 179). King also states "In an age when it has become mandatory for donors to stress the importance of country ownership of their own education agendas, it would indeed be paradoxical to discover that the allegedly global education agenda was perceived by many analysts in the south to have been principally developed by multilateral agencies in the north"<sup>1</sup> (2007, p. 378). In this way also the selection of MDG2 may be problematic. This research aims to fill that gap.

My background and rationale for undertaking the study have positioned the research in a particular way. Over time I have been sensitised to social responsibility. Various influences have led me to the view that poverty is an injustice, unnatural and an affront to human dignity. So an underlying assumption of this research is that those of us not suffering from poverty have a responsibility to help those who are, hence my interest in development policy. At the same time, with no experience working in the UN or related organisations, I am an outsider to UN policy processes. This reduces the possibility of my uncritically adopting elite policy actor perspectives. Potentially in contrast to this, through sport, education and career (educational leadership), I have had exposure to and worked in elite circles. This reduces the possibility of me being able to see the

---

<sup>1</sup> Here King is using the North/South division in the sense that developed countries of the north dominate developing countries of the south.



policy process from a developing country perspective. A related consideration is that researchers should be cautious in trying to “represent groups to which they themselves do not belong, not least these groups without power or voice, as this, itself, is a form of colonization and oppression” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 40). So this research is positioned between developing countries and elite policy actors. This positioning introduces a tension between highlighting the injustices of the MDG policy process and recognising MDG achievements. Interviewees (elite policy actors) revealed that they too struggle with such tensions. So this research is not positioned as a voice for or on behalf of the poor, nor for or on behalf of the global elite. Rather it is addressed primarily to policy actors, aiming to help us better understand the policy process and improve policy outcomes.

To reach findings this research uses a single case study method, tracing an historical policy process. Initially the study considers current literature, mostly from three theoretical perspectives. The first is a rational synoptic theory, promoting a rational approach, with various expert groups proposing policy priorities, based on a broad synoptic view of challenges and opportunities. The second is critical theory, looking at competing interests, shining light on unequal power relations and proposing alternatives. The third is world society theory, looking at the policy process as part of broader global trends, shared values and culture.

These three theoretical perspectives are used to generate three alternative hypotheses regarding *how* and *why* MDG2 came to be selected. Hypotheses help ensure that data are analysed and considered from multiple perspectives, eliminating at least some blind spots and reducing the impact of researcher bias. The rational synoptic hypothesis highlighted how policy actors considered the broader global context, and the successes of the policy process. Critical theory brought to light the hidden politics and vested interests at work. It provided the basis for recommendations for improving future policy processes. World society theory showed the remarkable acceptance of universal primary education as a policy priority and preferred educational model.

Hypotheses were also brought into dialogue with each other. Whilst initially the findings appear contradictory, bringing those hypotheses into dialogue forced more

sophisticated analysis. Despite the complexities of using three theories and three hypotheses, the findings are stronger and more nuanced as a result. Thus reinforcing Ball's view, that complex policy processes require the use of multiple theories (1994).

A range of data are used. The range includes UN policy texts from 1948 until the present, other written sources such as UN resolutions, verbatim records of UN gatherings, information contained on UN and other multilateral agency websites. Interviews with nine elite policy actors were conducted. One other policy actor provided helpful information via an email exchange. These interviews and exchanges were exceptionally helpful, providing rich accounts and demonstrating commitment to addressing poverty. At the same time, interviewees openly critiqued the process and provided constructive suggestions for the Sustainable Development Goals.

Various methods were used to source and analyse data. Policy texts and interview records were carefully coded. This helped track the emergence and prevalence of policy priorities and prominent themes. Critical Discourse Analysis, as provided by Fairclough (2003), was applied to "disarticulate and to critique texts" (Luke 1996, p. 20) and to "show the power relations... at work" (p. 40). A detailed chronological record of the policy process was created to help clarify what had occurred. Also a policy process relationships map was created to understand the effect of relationships on policy outcomes. Unfortunately, the relationships map had to be abandoned due to the overwhelming complexity of relationships in the policy process. Although this contributed to a finding regarding the opaque and complex nature of the MDG process.

Additionally, Millennium Development Goals were traced through policy texts. This showed that most of what became the MDGs were first included in a 1996 text by OECD DAC, then a text by the World Bank, IMF, OECD DAC and UN Secretary General in 2000, prior to the Millennium Summit. Process tracing revealed a remarkable acceptance and stability of education and health goals from 1996 through to 2015.

A research log was kept, recording the case study research process, reasons for decisions, successes and difficulties, interviews and reflections. Data collection and

analysis was thorough, systematic, comprehensive and consistent. This was necessary to enhance the reliability of findings.

This study reaches various findings. First that global challenges and opportunities were considered when selecting MDG2. It finds that MDG2 was accepted with a remarkable consensus among elite policy actors. This study finds that MDG2 came to be selected by surviving a complex, undemocratic and opaque policy process. Within that complex process, making it to the *Road Map Annex* (2001) was crucial<sup>2</sup>. The contents of that annex were controlled by a small group of elite policy actors from multi-lateral organisations. Whilst a motivation for selecting the MDGs was to combat poverty, there were other motivations too, including focussing and strengthening the UN as well as providing career opportunities for development professionals. There is no evidence that developing countries had much influence on MDG2's selection. As far as this research has been able to establish, the UN General Assembly never voted on the refined list of 8 MDGs, associated targets and indicators. This is contrary to the impression that the MDGs were unanimously accepted by UN Member States and represented world opinion. They did not.

In relation to education, whilst MDG2 remained unchanged between 1996 and 2015, other educational priorities were still in the mix but never became MDGs. For example in 2005, *Investing in Development* called for "ending user fees for primary schools" (p. xxi.) and completion of primary education, rather than just access to it, as per MDG2. It also discussed the importance of secondary and higher education, formal and informal education as well as quality. The *World Summit Outcome* (UN General Assembly 2005) gave equal attention to primary, secondary and tertiary education and included vocational and technical education, EFA and stressed the important role of UNESCO. But despite this, MDG2 as presented in the *Annex* (2001) remained the accepted policy text.

This study found no evidence that educators were among the elite policy actors who selected MDG2 and no evidence that elite policy actors determining the 8 MDGs

---

<sup>2</sup> The *Road Map towards the Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration* contained an annex, referred to in this study as the *Road Map Annex*. This contained a list of 8 MDGs, associated targets and indicators. It is the first time in the policy process that this list is included and as such is a vital text.

considered the EFA priorities. Also there is no evidence that educators contributed in a cohesive and effective way to the policy agenda at the time.

On the other hand, this study also found no evidence to support the argument that the MDGs were part of a global pro-rich plot by elite policy actors. Policy actors were addressing poverty. Interviews with 10 policy actors, 3 of whom were in the inner circle determining the MDGs, gave the impression of their being deeply and genuinely committed to poverty alleviation. They regarded the selection of a limited number of understandable, actionable and measurable priorities as an effective strategy in comparison with a raft of 1990's UN agreements that had broader goals, but achieved little. However elite policy actors, including the IMF, World Bank, OECD and development professionals, orchestrated a general and purposeful shift away from goals aiming to provide more equal outcomes, agreed to by the UN General Assembly, toward goals aiming to provide more equal opportunities. This established a policy architecture, meaning that the attempts to address poverty were done within the ruling global (neo-liberal) hegemony. Universal primary education fits neatly within that paradigm, increasing the likelihood of its selection.

Policies may produce real social effects (Ball 1994). Therefore decisions by elite policy actors are and should be open to critique. This study critiques the policy process and aims to be transformative. This grounds the research in critical realism, using Hill's justification for understanding the policy process "however irrational or uncontrollable it may seem to be- (as) a crucial first step towards trying to bring it under control" (1997, p. 5). As a single case study, the findings are not generalizable beyond this case, yet the reader might draw parallels with other policy processes. It is reasonable to accept that the findings are at least applicable to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) policy process, which follows the MDG process.

Another contribution of this research is that it provides an historical record of the MDG policy process. In particular, the period between the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) and the *Road Map Annex* (2001) was crucial in determining the policy priorities, and is not broadly understood. This contribution was not intended at the outset, but became obvious during data gathering stages.

In the next chapter the study looks at existing research and literature, to ascertain what it reveals about *how* and *why* MDG2 came to be selected. It generates three hypotheses, one for each theory. Following that, chapter three outlines the research method. Chapter four discusses the findings and relates them to the hypotheses outlined in the next chapter. Chapter 5 evaluates the hypotheses in relation to findings and theory. The concluding chapter brings the major findings together. It discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the research design and proposes implications for further research. Finally, the study uses the findings to propose implications for the SDG policy process. This is not central to the research question and may be considered controversial. However this research aims to help policy actors better understand and improve the policy process, so it is appropriate that this step is taken.

## 2. Theoretical perspectives

This chapter explores literature in relation to three theoretical frameworks: rational synoptic theory, critical theory and world society theory. Each is a particular formulation of those theories for this case study, grounded in the literature. For each theory, the chapter looks at its overarching paradigm, what this reveals about the policy process and UN policy processes. Finally, under each theory, this chapter looks at what it would predict about how and why MDG2 was selected. Each prediction is presented as a hypothesis.

This research has its origins in critical theory. Initially, the research question arose out of my wondering why the UN chose universal primary education as an MDG rather than an all sector approach. Based on Ball's (1993) suggestion that complex policy processes require multiple theory analysis, I was concerned that undertaking the case study by looking only through a critical theory lens would limit findings. Therefore I selected rational synoptic theory, allowing the policy process to speak on the terms in which the policy was presented to the broader public. For a third theory, my advisor suggested world society theory. Its relevance to the research question was immediately obvious and hence it was adopted.

At the outset it is important to state that the UN is complex, as are its policy processes. The UN consists of principal organs, main committees, subsidiary bodies, advisory subsidiary bodies, programmes and funds, research and training institutes, commissions, expert bodies, other related bodies, specialised agencies, related organisations, secretariats of conventions, UN trust funds and other UN entities (UN 2011a, UN 2011b). There are formal processes, informal processes, as well as direct and indirect advocacy efforts, interactions, hidden politics and involvement with non-governmental organizations and society at large. One page of the official United Nations website entitled 'structure and organisation' (UN 2011a) contained 102 links to UN entities. Each one of these 102 links, then, contained further links. The 'committees' link alone revealed another 38 UN entities (UN 2011b). Despite the complexity, understanding the UN and its policy processes is necessary because it

was through these that MDG2 was selected. Each theory is used to give a different perspective and set limits, so that the research can use systematic and defensible methods.

As will be seen in this chapter, there was abundant literature available regarding policy processes, UN policy processes and education in developing countries. However, in relation to the MDG selection process and the selection of MDG2, there appears to be very little.

## **2.1 Rational synoptic theory**

From a rational or synoptic perspective (Souto-Otero 2013) the policy process should comprise policy actors making rational policy decisions, based on a range of data, for an agreed purpose. This theory is concerned largely with leaders of institutions, assuming that they are serving particular interests and grouped into institutional categories (Sabatier 2007). Policy actors focus on macro-level outcomes, brought about by the combined action of individuals, groups, organisations or nation-states. Rational synoptic theory applies economic rationalism to the policy process, wherein actors weigh up the costs and benefits of various alternatives at their disposal and decide upon a course of action to deliver the agreed outcome.

From this theoretical perspective our survival depends upon specialists using empirically grounded scientific knowledge, practice and reliable feedback to make unbiased, complex analyses to address social dilemmas (Ostrom 1998). Under this framework rational policy actors, under certain optimal circumstances, achieve optimal collective outcomes because they have a broad synoptic view of the situation and they have the expertise to solve the problems. For Ostrom, without the structure of such a rational synoptic process, humans often act as self-interested, short-term maximizers. So policy decisions are not the domain of the general public, rather of specialists. This is why Ostrom (1998) regards the 'rational choice theory of collective action' as "*the* central subject of political science...(and) the core of justification for the state" (p. 1). Elster (1994) proposes that a rationalistic approach "is first and foremost a normative or prescriptive theory. It tells people how to choose and to act in order to achieve their

aims as well as possible. It offers also, but only secondarily, an explanatory account of human behaviour" (pp. 21-22).

Souto-Otero (2013) shows that the rational or synoptic model in practice can be based on six steps for decision-making. These are: 1- problem identification, 2- establishing goals, 3- generating all possible alternatives, 4- examining the likely consequences of the alternatives, 5- selecting the best alternative, 6- implementation and evaluation of the decision. Of course Souto-Otero recognises the limitations of this model and in the same article outlines alternatives. Essentially the model is proposing that rational action should be grounded in a broad or synoptic view of the information available to the policy actor. The information available, even though broad, is still partial and subjective. Therefore, the policy actor should acquire an optimal amount of information, form an estimate of the benefit of each option, and act (Elster 1994).

A rational approach is also influenced by social norms. Social norms are "enforced by members of the general community, and not always out of self-interest" (Elster 1994, p. 24). There are consequences for conforming to social norms and consequences for going against them. Staying within accepted norms generally makes it easier for policy priorities to be accepted (Elster 1994).

Emotions also play a part in a rational synoptic approach. Emotions arouse policy actor motivation. Emotions colour the picture of the situation being addressed. The motivation itself affects the policy actor's rational view of the social situation and their subsequent course of action. Therefore a rational synoptic approach is influenced by social norms, emotions and has an element of subjectivity (Elster 1994).

There are numerous criticisms of rational synoptic theory. Hill (1997) believes that policy processes are inherently and deeply irrational and, as such, rational choice theory is severely limited in trying to explain policy processes. It lacks a critical analysis of how issues can be defined, formulated and even manipulated to set the agenda. Ultimately the importance of an issue is a value judgement (Souto-Otero 2013). Sabatier (2007) believes that rational choice theory has outlived its explanatory adequacy because it does not reflect the reality of the policy process. Ostrom (2007) acknowledges the difficulties of working in the rational synoptic field, yet still promotes



the value of the theory because of the level of reliability it can add. She remained committed to the framework because it provides “systematic, comparative institutional assessments... (without which) recommendations of reform may be based on naïve ideas about which kinds of institutions are “good” or “bad” and not an analysis of performance” (p. 26).

### **2.1.1 The UN as a policy actor according to rational synoptic theory**

The UN largely describes itself using the rational synoptic framework. A guide to UN decision-making (2007) published by the UN Non-Governmental Liaison Service (hereunder referred to as *The Guide*) shows this. It sets out to explain the “governance and decision-making fora and processes of the United Nations” (preface). *The Guide* states that the primary role of the United Nations is to serve as an international forum for addressing global concerns, situating UN policy processes within the rational synoptic theory framework and validating Ostrom’s view of its dominance in international relations (1997).

According to *The Guide* the steps of a UN decision-making process include:

- Election of officers for the meeting; agreement on organizational issues
- Preparation and consideration of initial draft outcome text
- Integration of agreed changes and proposals by the Secretariat, the chair or a facilitator
- Additional rounds of negotiations and changes
- The final text, adopted by consensus
- Notification of any reservations by individual governments
- For legally binding instruments: ratification.

*The Guide* also highlights the sometimes non-linear nature of UN decision-making, emphasising the importance of consensus wherein member states work together “In the belief that strong collective support can help transform written agreements into affective action” (UN NGLS 2007, Introduction).

According to *The Guide* there are a wide variety of stakeholders in UN policy decision-making. Specialised funds and agencies, NGOs and members of civil society “Contribute to and are shaped by the United Nations’ political processes” (UN NGLS

2007, p. 25), by speaking to delegates, providing reports, other forms of background information and carry out specific activities. According to UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, without the contribution of these various stakeholders "Today, no UN development effort... can make real headway" (UN NGLS 2007, p. XII). This reflects the rational synoptic paradigm in so far as the input of a wide variety of stakeholders should add to the quality of social dilemma analysis, constituting a type of collective intelligence. According to *The Guide* involvement of the greater public in UN policy processes is now possible directly, mobilizing hundreds of thousands of people on a range of issues.

Thakur and Weiss (2009) help describe the phenomenon of growing non-state policy actor involvement by describing 'three UN's'. The first comprised of member states, the second of the secretariats and the third of actors that are associated with the world organisation but not formally part of it. "This 'insider-outsider' UN includes NGOs, academics, consultants, experts, independent commissions, and other groups" (p. 21). They believe that these informal networks often affect shifts in priorities, policies and practices.

So according to the rational synoptic theory paradigm the UN is a multi-layer organisation. UN policy actors focus on macro-level outcomes, brought about by the combined action of individuals, groups, organisations and nation-states. They weigh up the costs and benefits of various alternatives at their disposal and decide by consensus on a course of action. Effectiveness depends upon unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas, based on input from a variety of stakeholders.

#### **2.1.2. From a rational synoptic perspective what reasons would we expect to find for the selection of MDG2?**

From a rational synoptic perspective universal primary education has had a credible history as a UN policy priority. According to the UN "Most of the targets set by the *Millennium Declaration* were not new. They derived from the global conferences of the 1990's and from the body of international norms and laws that had been codified over the past half-century" (UN Secretary General 2001, p. 8). Also there is a long-standing view that education is important for economic development and social progress. The position of the World Bank for 25 years leading up to the selection of MDGs quite

consistently held that the rate of return on primary education was greater than secondary and higher education (Psacharopoulos 2006). As a result of this rational analysis and long-standing commitment to universal primary education, its selection as an MDG makes sense under a rational synoptic theoretical framework.

Rational decision making by policy actors who selected MDG2 would depend upon empirically grounded scientific understanding. Specialists would be required to make reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas and show how MDG2 would address these. MDG2 would focus on macro- level outcomes addressing social dilemmas. Targets would be designed to be clear and trigger action for development. Thus the UN would have applied economic rationalism to the selection of MDG2, weighing up the costs and benefits of various alternatives at their disposal and deciding on universal primary education as a course of action to deliver the best outcomes.

Under this theoretical framework MDG2 is seen as part of a successful tradition of goal setting and accountability structures that deliver progress. Emmerij et al (2005) state that the MDGs have “aroused much scepticism. Yet careful analysis shows that over the last forty years the UN has set some fifty development goals, with a record of performance that is more encouraging than often realized” (p. 216).

The UN Millennium Project describes the MDG policy process in rational synoptic theory terms, stating that the MDGs have “galvanized unprecedented efforts to meet the needs of the world’s poorest” (UN 2012). The Secretary General also used the rational synoptic paradigm to describe the process. He stated that the selection of MDGs had benefited from suggestions from all the departments, funds and programmes in the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and from the other executive agencies represented in the Advisory Committee on Coordination, including the World Bank, IMF and WTO. Non-governmental organizations, civil society and the academic community had also provided suggestions (UN Secretary General 2001).

Under the rational synoptic framework, the hypothesis regarding how and why MDG2 came to be selected is as follows:

MDG2 was an effective strategy selected as a part of a rational policy process to reverse the grinding poverty, hunger and disease affecting millions. The policy process engaged specialists in providing reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of global challenges and opportunities, particularly in relation to poverty.

The table below shows indicators used to assess the rational synoptic theory hypothesis.

Table 2.1: *Indicators* used to assess the rational synoptic theory hypothesis

1.	<i>MDG2 selection based on a broad or synoptic view of the information available to policy actors.</i>
2.	<i>Policy process is collective action of individuals, groups, organisations and nation-states.</i>
3.	<i>Clear, time bound targets.</i>
4.	<i>Universal primary education as part of a successful tradition of goal setting and accountability structures that deliver progress.</i>
5.	<i>Purposive action on the part of development professionals with relevant expertise.</i>
6.	<i>Policy actors using rational, empirically grounded scientific understanding and data, unbiased, complex and full analysis in selecting MDG2.</i>
7.	<i>Legitimate, transparent, accountable decision making.</i>
8.	<i>Addressing poverty as persistent and central policy concern.</i>

## 2.2 Critical theory

Critical theory identifies false or fragmented consciousness that has brought “An individual or social group to relative powerlessness” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 26). It interrogates “Power systems and inequality structures that dominate and oppress people in societies” (Sarantakos 2005, p. 51), challenging the common sense of how societies and communities should operate. This requires researchers to question what appears obvious and to “construct their perception of the world... in a manner that undermines what appears natural” (Kincheloe & McLaren 2000, p. 303). Critical theory explores who is empowered as a result of a policy process and who is disempowered

(Cohen et al 2007). It explores how established power structures empower and enable certain groups and disempower and constrain other groups. Critical theory shows and how these structures reinforce themselves over time with real material affects.

Critical theory also shows how the organisational context shapes what is possible and what is not possible. Policies enter into social situations, its readers and the context of response have histories and different motivations (Adam & Kriesi 2007). Policy target groups either exist or are constructed to serve particular interests (Ingram et al 2007). From a critical theory perspective the policy process is deeply irrational. The concept of rationality has been co-opted by policy elites to present their intentions and decisions as efficient, as ethical, and as effective (Hill 1997). So policy elites can easily attach rational intentions to policy decisions retrospectively, leaving the deep irrationality of the policy process unacknowledged (Hill 1997).

Likewise policy texts are anything but stable, closed and complete (Ball 1994). Rather they are the result of power-derived negotiation and compromise along the way to get the policy finalised. Some people have more power in the policy process than others (Hill 1997, Vidovich 2007). Only certain “influences and agendas are recognised as legitimate, only certain voices are heard at any point in time” (Ball 1994, p. 16). For Bourdieu (2006) this happens because power relationships tend to reproduce themselves and these are born out in structures with real material affects. So not every outcome in a policy process is equally possible or impossible. Rather, priorities are filtered.

A critical theory perspective also shows how the meaning of a policy text does not necessarily correspond to the author’s intentions. This is what Codd (1998) refers to as the intentional fallacy. The policy may contain incoherence, distortions and omissions, showing the inability of language to produce coherent meaning. Policy texts also change over time. Resulting in the blurring of meaning, public confusion and doubt. According to Codd (1998) these contradictions frequently lead to policy failure, yet often remain unrecognized. As confusion arises, policy actors re-explain and re-present policies. More gaps then open up for different interpretations of the policy and interpretations of interpretations, leading to yet more confusion (Ball 1994). So the *encoding* of policy texts is complex.

Policy texts are also *decoded* in complex ways. Decoding depends on context in which they are read and by whom they are read (Codd, 1998). Thus policies enter into existing power relationships, varying commitment, understanding, capability, resources, practical limitations, cooperation and patterns of inequality. Policies are therefore taken up differently as a result (Ball 1993).

Critical theorists recognise that policies enter into situations where other policies already exist. So the success of a policy in part depends on inter-textual compatibility (Ball 1994). As the number of policies accumulate, fundamental contradictions at the policy level arise. For Codd (1998) such contradictions also lead to policy failure. So policies are “Always in a state of ‘becoming’, of ‘was’ and ‘never was’ and ‘not quite’”(Ball 1993, p. 11). The policy process is in perpetual motion and is messy (Ball 1994, Vidovich 2007).

Finally, from a critical theory perspective, language affects the policy process because it is an instrument of power. Meaning is more than just *described by* language, rather *inscribed in* language (Bourdieu 2006, Codd 1998). Language can include or exclude, transform or reinforce, enlighten or suppress (Codd 1998). It can create social constructs, frame problems and therefore determine ways of thinking about policy solutions. Language and the policy discourse have power. Discourses determine not only what can be said and thought but also “Who can speak, when, where and with what authority” (Ball 1994, p. 22).

### **2.2.1 The UN as a policy actor according to critical theory**

From a critical theory perspective, the UN does not primarily address global concerns as it claims. Rather the UN has a general bias toward affluent countries (Escobar 2004, Ilcan 2006, King 2007, Pogge 2010<sup>3</sup>). Pogge puts forward that the rules of international relations favour affluent countries “By allowing them to continue protecting their markets through tariffs, anti-dumping duties, quotas, export credits, and huge subsidies to domestic producers in ways that poor countries are not permitted, or cannot afford, to match” (2010, p. 35). Much of this is done under the guise of an open market and level playing field, yet it is anything but that. What is

---

<sup>3</sup> It is not proposed that these authors are all critical theorists, but that aspects of what they have written relate to critical theory

given in aid is taken back by the rules of international relations and trade favouring developed countries.

From a critical theory perspective the UN and related funds and agencies are part of a ruling hegemony. This hegemony is perpetuated in the context of the globalisation of the economy. It is also perpetuated by the imposition of norms such as free-markets, Western-style democracy and cultural notions of consumption, as well as solutions derived from human capital theory, foreign ownership and the imposition of a recognisable governance structure and privatisation (Escobar 2004, Moutsios 2009). Whilst the UN General Assembly is a gathering of 193 nation states, in practice Western cultural norms and solutions of only a limited number of those states dominate.

Accompanying the ascendance of the global ruling hegemony is the globalisation of policy-making. Whilst trans-national organisations have existed for some time, it is since the 1990's that the role and scope of their policy agendas have expanded dramatically (Moutsios 2009). According to Moutsios such institutions make policy decisions that are "Largely asymmetric, nondemocratic and opaque" (p. 478). For Chabbott, this ruling hegemony has institutionalised rules that transcend nation-states, local culture and politics. Their rules "Define legitimate actors, script those actors' activities. And designate their spheres of influence" (Chabbott 2003, p. 163). For Bourdieu (2006) these shifts have reduced everything to economics and reflect the widespread ascendancy of neo-liberalism. The policy process is dominated by international economic activity, organisations and Western rationality<sup>4</sup>, therefore assuming primacy over nation-states in their capacity to govern (Ilcan 2006). From this perspective there is "scepticism about the normative idea of world opinion as a moral consensus that bestows... legitimacy" (Jaeger 2008, p. 609). The global order building machinery is founded on flawed assumptions. This includes the assumption that Western solutions will fix 3<sup>rd</sup> World problems, ignoring the fact that these solutions are in part the cause of current injustices (Escobar 2004). So whilst on the surface the

---

<sup>4</sup> 'Western' refers to loose knit conglomeration of nation-states, organisations and individuals that are associated with Western rationality, with roots in the enlightenment. Also there is a correlation with neo-liberal economics: free market economies, capitalism, the reduction of state ownership of resources and services toward privatisation and new public management.

rhetoric implies fairness, in practice there are not equal opportunities for all and certainly not equal policy outcomes.

Critical theorists also question the role that nation-states play, even if they are currently a widely assumed and accepted form of governance. Whilst the UN presents itself as primarily a gathering of nation-states, Pogge (2010) says we must ask ourselves whether it is acceptable to recognise governments merely because they exercise power within a country. For Pogge we cannot disregard how they acquired power or how they exercise power. Even if a government is legitimate we could not confidently say that they represent the views of their constituency. It is unrealistic to think of a nation-state as a unitary actor, rather as heterogeneous interest groups (Drazen 2006). From this perspective the prominent role of the nation-state is questioned.

Critics also warn against making the false assumption that NGOs serve as stand-ins for the poor (Chabbott 2003). Some believe that agencies are co-opting NGOs for their own purposes (Jones 2007). According to Jones 1990's UN conferences provided an example of this. In these conferences a wide range of interest groups including NGO's and civil society promoted a range of priorities. These priorities were agreed to alongside and interconnected with the Bretton Woods institutions' agenda on trade, debt and development financing. Broad consultation and involvement in these conferences gave a certain moral weight to *all* decisions taken, without being able to establish who supported what priorities. In this way the Bretton Woods institutions could claim NGO and civil society support without evidence of exactly who supported their priorities or even without evidence of who NGO's represented. These same 1990's agreements shaped the MDGs.

From a critical theory perspective, increasing power in the hands of UN development professionals can also be problematic, particularly because they are well positioned to make decisions in their own interests. Once institutions become established, they take on a life of their own. According to Chabbott (2003) development professionals set agendas, establish priorities, and mandate actions "somewhat independently of both nation-states that funded them and their stated beneficiaries" (p. 2). She uses the example of the World Conference on Education for All (Jomtien 1990) which,



according to her, was not an initiative of nation-states but of the leaders of UN organizations and other international development organizations. King (2007) makes similar observations, challenging the assumption that the presence of 155 national delegations meant that the EFA resolution was “Widely shared across the world- which it almost certainly was not” (p. 381). For King also it is no secret that the World Bank and multilateral agencies control education policy processes. King states “James Wolfensohn, then president of the World Bank, was open enough to admit that ‘The Bank’, together with our UN agency partners, and bilateral development sponsors, have led the EFA process over the past 10 years” (2007, p. 386). According to Meyer et al, in the current policy climate it is professionals, researchers, scientists, and intellectuals who constitute “The new religious elites... who write secularized and unconditionally universalistic versions of the salvation story, along with the managers, legislators, and policymakers who believe the story fervently and pursue it relentlessly” (1997, p. 174).

From this perspective the end result of UN policy processes is that poorer countries are “Falling further and further behind (and) the global poor become ever more marginalized” (Pogge 2010, p. 35). If, as Ilcan (2006) says, the ruling institutional order helps create winners and losers, then in so far as the UN reinforces the global governing order, it also bears a degree of responsibility for the poverty that occurs as a result of it. For Jones the shadow of global power imbalances “Continues to hang over the entire enterprise” (2007, p. 321). For Vandemoortele (2011) it is not more aid that will solve global poverty, but greater equality. Finally, from Pogge (2010), the rather sobering view that marginalization of the poor does not happen because people harbor ill will toward them, rather because “The poor have no friends among the global elite” (p. 62). From a critical theory perspective it is the global elite who determine the outcomes of UN policy processes, outcomes that are at least partly in the elite’s own interests, even if presented as being entirely in the interests of the poor.

### **2.2.2 From a critical theory perspective what reasons would we expect to find for the selection of MDG2?**

Vandemoortele (2011), an MDG policy actor, said that the MDGs original intention was transformative and structural. Yet over time their theoretical framework and approach was steered away from that. The approach to addressing poverty was reduced to

foreign aid, charitable projects, the application of a particular policy framework and good governance. Vandemoortele says

“The poverty debate has been dollarized, and the MDG discourse has been donorized. However, the MDGs cannot be reduced to a standard set of macroeconomic policies and sectoral interventions of a technical nature. They require fundamental transformations in society” (p. 18).

In regards to MDG2 then, it is possible that it was also a result of a downward revision of 1990's EFA targets and movement away from seeking fundamental transformations in society through education. EFA took an all sector approach and was not restricted to the provision of primary schooling (Unterhalter 2014). Whereas MDG2 was concerned solely with the provision of primary schooling. So MDG2 could be interpreted as purposefully diverting resources away from secondary and higher education, relegating poorer countries to the intellectual periphery and making them dependent on ideas and technology developed elsewhere. Thus MDG2 reproduces and exacerbates inequalities, making poor countries less able to compete on global markets with real social and economic effects on the population (Samoff 1999, Rizvi & Lingard 2006). This would be coupled with international WTO rules requiring developing countries to open their markets to global competition, whilst developed countries continue to protect their own. This was especially relevant in agriculture (Jolly et al 2009). MDG2 fit neatly within the existing global economic, social and political architecture, making it more likely to be selected. Whereas goals aiming for a radical transformation that could threaten the balance of power and threaten the dominance of the global elite were more likely to be excluded.

According to Klees (2008), for years developing countries have complained about the short-sightedness of World Bank policy particularly prioritising primary over secondary and tertiary education. These complaints had an effect in that the “Bank completely reversed its position on the relative efficiency of investment in higher education. In a 1999 joint analysis of higher education with UNESCO, the Bank essentially said that it was wrong for the past twenty years” (Klees 2008, p. 316). According to Klees the then-president James Wolfensohn, stated “The Bank had miscalculated the rate of return to higher education, thus basing its 25-year policy arguing for the clear superiority of investment in primary education on invalid data” (p. 317). Although Klees

claim is not entirely correct because it was a report by a task force that took this position, not the World Bank leadership. In the late 1990's the World Bank and UNESCO appointed this task force to look at the role of higher education in developing economies. The task force was comprised of 16 core members, mostly with a higher education background, and many more contributors. The report states

“Rate-of-return studies treat educated people as valuable only through their higher earnings and the greater tax revenues extracted by society. But educated people clearly have many other effects on society: educated people are well positioned to be economic and social entrepreneurs, having a far-reaching impact on the economic and social wellbeing of their communities. They are also vital to creating an environment in which economic development is possible. Good governance, strong institutions, and a developed infrastructure are all needed if business is to thrive-and none of these is possible without highly educated people. Finally, rate-of-return analysis entirely misses the impact of university-based research on the economy-a far-reaching social benefit that is at the heart of any argument for developing strong higher education systems” (Task Force on Higher Education and Society 2000, p. 39).

This report “was launched on March 1st 2000 at the World Bank in Washington” (Task Force on Higher Education and Society 2000). Therefore it is almost certain that the Bank leadership would have had the report. This was before Dakar, where World Bank President, James Wolfensohn, still supported universal primary education as a single fast-track initiative (Max). It was before the release of *A Better World for All* that identified universal primary education. It was also before universal primary education was selected as one of 8 MDGS in 2001.

As MDG2 was selected following research that disproved the rate of return analysis on primary education it is possible also that MDG2 came to be selected to suit the needs and motivations of those in powerful positions in the UN and related funds and agencies and not because it was the best strategy for addressing poverty. A longitudinal study of Brazil, Ghana and Taiwan by Kosack (2012) found that primary education was a priority when it helped a government stay in power. In other words when the provision of primary education was a priority for the government's vital constituency, it followed that this was a priority for the government, because it was in

the government's interest to stay in power. Whether the government was democratically elected or not had no bearing because all ruling governments have a vital constituency, whether that is the whole population, the military or a limited and powerful elite. So, based on Kosack's research, we would explore whose interests the selection of MDG2 was serving. It is possible that MDG2 came to be selected because it suited the interests of the vital constituency supporting and influencing elite policy actors. Under the guise of helping the poor, MDG2 was selected at the expense of developing countries.

MDG2 also reflects a functionalist view of education. For Ball, there is an "increasing colonisation of education policy by economic policy imperatives" (1998, p. 122). According to Bergeron (2008) the Bank and the IMF continue to promote the priorities of the Washington consensus despite claims that they have moved beyond it. The push toward privatisation and marketization is not being reversed, rather privatisation and marketisation of education is "touted as the best way to achieve the goals of human capital development (Rose 2003)... By framing education in such an instrumental manner, the Bank continues to focus on the narrow definition of development as economic efficiency and growth rather than truly equitable and democratic development" (p. 350). This rather pragmatic view may give powerful insight into how and why MDG2 was selected, implying that its selection may have suited powerful policy actors whilst appearing to be motivated by the desire to address poverty.

Following from the above, a critical theory perspective would predict a close link between private sector interests globally and the selection of MDG2. For private sector interests to thrive globally it is in their advantage to situate production and other functions in developing countries due to lower labour costs. For the private sector to take advantage of lower labour costs in developing countries a reliable, literate, skilled work force is required. Primary education is a step in that direction.

These critical theory perspectives lead to the second hypothesis that:

MDG2 was selected as part of an undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process. It represented a downward revision of 1990's EFA targets, diverting resources away from secondary and higher education, relegating developing

countries to the intellectual periphery and making them less able to compete on world markets. Therefore MDG2 did not represent world opinion, but reinforced the UN's role as part of a ruling apparatus, reinforced the existing global ruling hegemony and served the interests of the powerful.

The table below shows indicators used to assess the critical theory hypothesis.

Table 2.2: *Indicators used to assess the critical theory hypothesis*

1.	<i>Undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process.</i>
2.	<i>Policy process largely irrational but presented as rational.</i>
3.	<i>Downward revision of goals and targets set in the Education for All process (Jomtien, Dakar).</i>
4.	<i>Evidence that resources were purposefully diverted away from secondary and higher education.</i>
5.	<i>Gradual erosion of pro developing country policy priorities.</i>
6.	<i>Policy decisions serving developed country and private sector interests.</i>
7.	<i>Relatively stable and shared pro developed country priorities by dominant policy actors.</i>
8.	<i>Claiming world-opinion and pro poor to justify decisions and conceal other interests and motivations.</i>
9.	<i>Policy decisions made by dominant policy actors without evidence that decisions reflect world opinion.</i>
10.	<i>Developing countries have little or no say in MDG2 selection.</i>
11.	<i>Policy process driven by elite policy actors/ development professionals, who ensure an expansion of the scale of UN activities.</i>
12.	<i>Unequal power relationships reproduce themselves in the policy process.</i>
13.	<i>Policy reinforcing existing global ruling hegemony including neo-liberal priorities such as market fundamentalism of self-regulating markets dis-embedded from the social context and new public management.</i>
14.	<i>Education used to pave the way for private sector interests.</i>

## 2.3 World society theory

World society theory advances the view that “many features of the contemporary nation-state derive from worldwide models constructed and propagated through global cultural and associational processes” (Meyer et al 1997, pp. 144-145). For Meyer the theory attempts to account for why societies, organized as nation-states, are similar in unexpected dimensions and change in similar ways, despite having different economic, social and political circumstances. Nation-state policies and education policies are shaped by universal norms and culture.

The world society culture and associated norms at the time of the MDG process, according to Dale (2000), were “those of Western modernity, they centre on progress and justice and are associated with the construction of the ideas of the state and the individual” (Dale 2000, p. 429). Worldwide models define agendas for local action, shaping structures and policies, for virtually all of the domains of social life. These include “rules of economic production and consumption, political structure, and education; science, technique, and medicine; family life, sexuality, and interpersonal relations; and religious doctrines and organization. In each arena, the range of legitimately defensible forms is fairly narrow” (Meyer et al 1997, p. 162). Education policy is also justified by widely accepted claims about progress, justice and the natural order. These claims come from a dominant global culture (Meyer et al 1987, Dale 2000). Klees (2008) refers to this as “the Washington Consensus in education” (p. 312).

The policy process is explained in terms of isomorphism and expansive structuration. That is, policy actors make decisions that resemble other policy decisions in surprisingly and unexpectedly similar ways (Chabbott 2003). Nation-states are not primarily self-directed policy actors, responding rationally to internal and external contingencies; rather they are reliant on external models.

World society theory goes beyond nation-state or transnational organizational analysis. It has a type of statelessness, emphasising the influence of cultural and supranational forces at a global level (Dale 2000). According to world society theorists social scientists have tended to explain policies and decisions by power relations between

nation-state actors or other defined organisations or bodies. They have relied on institutional theoretical perspectives that are micro-realist, viewing nation-states as natural, purposive, and rational actors, for which culture is largely irrelevant, or at least only relevant at a local level. World society theory uses macro-realist arguments, viewing the nation-state as “the creature of worldwide systems of economic or political power, exchange, and competition” (Meyer et al 1997, p. 147). So the nation-state is viewed as culturally constructed and embedded in a world culture, rather than as the un-analysed rational actor.

The gradual adoption of a world societal model is explained by DiMaggio & Powell (1983) as arising from three sorts of isomorphism, those being coercive, mimetic and normative.

Coercive isomorphism occurs when there is political influence over what is accepted as legitimate. These expectations come from organizations, groups and may even be broader cultural expectations. Even though some of these may be largely ceremonial, they can still be consequential (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). Also, with a centralizing tendency “the expansion of the central state, the centralization of capital, and the coordination of philanthropy all support the homogenization of organizational models through direct authority relationships” (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 151).

Mimetic isomorphism occurs when organizations model themselves on other organizations (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). This often happens when organizational technologies are poorly understood, goals are ambiguous, or the climate is uncertain. Modelling oneself on what others do can provide a viable and effective solution to uncertainty at little expense, especially when the organizations that is being copied is perceived “to be more legitimate or successful” (DiMaggio & Powell 1983, p. 152).

Normative isomorphism is associated with professionalization of fields (DiMaggio & Powell 1983). World society culture in the last half of the twentieth century saw bureaucratization and homogenization become dominant. For DiMaggio & Powell (1983) there is firstly the effect of formal education of professionals. Their education tends to establish and reinforce norms. There is often the growth of professional networks that also reinforce and distribute norms. So a particular way of doing things

and a particular set of values becomes the norm. For Dale (2000) professions “have become the great rationalizers of the second half of the twentieth century”. These professionals and bureaucrats have become the new global elite of policy processes. Theorists, such as Hill (1997), are interested in the extent to which bureaucrats/ professionals have privileged influence in the policy process. They are in a strong position because much power is concentrated in their hands (Chabbott 2003, Emmerij 2005, King 2007, Psacharopoulos 2006).

Pierson’s work (2000), from an historical institutionalist perspective, relates to normative isomorphism. It shows the tendency of an institution, an organisation or a policy process to stay on its current pathway. It is too simplistic to assume that this is un-reflexive. Rather it is based on the belief that the pathway will deliver increasing returns over time. This has both an historical and an institutional dimension. The historical dimension shows how processes unfold over time and how norms become widely accepted. The institutional dimension shows how a pathway, once established, becomes “embedded in institutions-whether formal rules, policy structures, or norms” (Pierson 2000, p. 264). In this sense the trajectory of the policy process is influenced both by its history and by institutional norms.

The world society theory framework also proposes that world society culture has a substantial effect on global cultural processes and international relations. From this perspective it is reasonable to argue that dominant actors shape other nation-states and world culture. However it is not reasonable to argue that the characteristics of world society culture arise only through the purposive action of constructed nation-state actors. Rather a global cultural associational process is at work. Thus “contemporary world culture is not passive and inert but highly dynamic in its own right” (Meyer et al 1997, p. 168).

A difficulty highlighted by world society theory is that there are often contradictions and inconsistencies within world society cultural models. For example, there are unresolved contradictions between environmental responsibility and economic growth, yet both are taken for granted as universal values. The co-existence of MDG7 (environmental sustainability) and MDG8 (global partnership for development) illustrate this point.



Dale (2000) points out three difficulties with world society theory. The first is that we can falsely assume that a policy reflecting global cultural norm matches what is actually happening on the ground. Second is the issue of language, where what is implied by terminology can vary between policy actors. So even though we might find similar terminology in different locations, it does not mean that people understand and apply that terminology in the same way. Third, the convergence of stated priorities may be a process, or it may be an outcome of a phenomenon, but it is not clear which. Therefore establishing the cause of a phenomenon is not possible with world society theory.

### **2.3.1 The UN as a policy actor according to world society theory**

From a world society theory perspective, the UN and developed nation-states are not necessarily formulating and driving a policy agenda that developing nation-states are bound to follow. Rather, the UN and its member states are themselves the subject of a widely accepted world society culture and a perpetuator of that culture. Anticipated policy outcomes would drive developing countries to mimic developed nation-states. The desire for these anticipated outcomes would be almost unquestioned, and Western norms would be characterized as an inevitable end-point (Dale 2000). For Dale (2000) there are four consequences of this account and these are relevant to the UN. The first is that within the UN and related agencies there would be “an extraordinary array of legitimated actors reified as purposive and rational” (p. 430). Second, policy actors would have more legitimacy if they were part of the nation-state or an associated organization. Third, entities that were tied in to the theories of justice and progress would have gained “special standing above all others” (p. 430). Finally the policy priorities selected would only be loosely coupled to the practical needs and goals in operation of the recipient developing countries. This is because policy priorities “derive from universalistic cultural ideology, dominant cultural forms, including the structure and boundaries of collective action, are relatively standardized across societies” (p. 430). In this way, selected policy priorities are more a ritual enactment of “broad based cultural prescriptions rather than rational responses to concrete problems” (Dale 2000, p. 430).

An important component of this Western cultural ideology, are new public management strategies. The UN, and related organisations, establish goals and exercise control through conditionality attached to funding and the burdens of associated debt (Moutsios 2009). Progress is monitored through data gathering, regulation and control and reported on through devices such as the *Global Monitoring Report*. Ilcan and Phillips (2010) refer to this UN activity as the standardization of the conduct of populations, “achieved through the calculation of many areas of social and economic life, including (but not limited to) education, food production and consumption, peace and security and trade” (p. 850). So whilst the UN and an array of legitimated actors are not a global government, they perpetuate world society culture and exercise substantial control through techno-scientific means.

Related to new public management strategies is multilateral surveillance as discussed by Schäfer (2006). This is relevant to the UN as a policy actor because core elements of the multilateral surveillance processes (such as the Open Method of Coordination) were central to the MDG policy process. Core elements included specific timelines for achieving goals, quantitative indicators, periodic monitoring, and evaluation and peer review. According to Schäfer, the IMF and OECD have used this method for years. The typical policy process is first establishing non-binding common goals. These goals are implemented at a national level, monitored and reported on, followed by multilateral discussion. Then recommendations and publication of achievement in relation to goals follow. Peer pressure is used to address poor performance.

Another key feature of world society culture in powerful organisations, such as the UN, is the growing prominence of bureaucrats and development professionals (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) and the subsequent prominence of normative isomorphism in policy outcomes. Whilst the UN is claimed to be primarily a gathering of nation-states (UN NGLS 2007), in practice those working in the UN Secretariat and other organisations would have substantial influence in policy processes. For DiMaggio & Powell (1983) “managers and key staff are drawn from the same universities and filtered on a common set of attributes, they will tend to view problems in a similar fashion, see the same policies, procedures and structures as normatively sanctioned and legitimated, and approach decisions in much the same way” (p. 153). According to Escobar, development professionals tend not to question the underlying Western/positivist

assumptions of their work. Rather they recognise the “Inconsistencies and absurdities of their work, but remain convinced of its underlying worth, committed to their colleagues, and/or unwilling or unable to find another line of work” (1995, p. 232). Therefore there is a self-perpetuating tendency. This links to Buchanan’s (1988) basic thesis. Buchanan says that bureaucracy is politically driven and that the public sector’s primary role is not so much to solve problems but to perpetuate itself.

Finally, under this paradigm, development professionals, as well as organisations, donors and beneficiaries, would have rationalised activities such as world conferences and summits as norms of policy processes. Conferences and summits perpetuate the development phenomenon, serve an important public relations function and legitimise UN work. James Jonah, former United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, provides a sobering thought regarding UN conferences, stating:

“The general view was that they (conferences) are good in terms of raising consciousness... But frankly, realistically, and honestly, it was also as a bureaucratic device by the Secretariat to create institutions. If you look, many of these things came out of conferences. Someone in the Secretariat would be planning, ‘how many posts am I going to get?... Most of it is conceived of by people who want to advance their careers’ (as cited in Emmerij et al 2005, p. 227).

### **2.3.2 From a world society theory perspective what reasons would we expect to find for the selection of MDG2?**

From this perspective, education policy priorities in various locations would resemble one another quite remarkably. For Ramirez and Ventresca, mass schooling now has an increasingly familiar set of general ideological and organizational arrangements. Over time diverse processes have gradually converged and we have developed “one normative institutional model [that] was increasingly linked to the ascendant nation-state [which was] itself fostered by a world political culture emerging from the conflicting dynamics of the world capitalist economy” (as cited in Dale 2000, p. 430). Demonstration of their theory is found “in the massive and rapid spread of national educational systems and in the unexpected global isomorphism (which)... occurs irrespective of national economic, political and cultural differences” (Dale, p. 430). For Dale, this remarkable similarity “cannot be explained by the functional, national-

cultural, or rational-instrumental theories that have dominated the study of educational systems or the curriculum hitherto” (p.430). Rather, with the breakdown of colonies, nation-states tend to take on the conventions of established nation-states that are rational, emphasising “economic, political, and cultural individualism” (p. 430). So a particular model of education, resembling that of established nation-states, becomes central to the modernising mission of developing countries.

For the selection of MDG2, we should expect that, if universal primary education had been a widely accepted development priority in developed states and powerful transnational organisations, then it would be no surprise that it would be included as a policy priority within the MDG policy process. MDG2 would be selected because it was the widely held common sense to do so. A remarkable consensus would be evident regarding the importance of universal primary education among elite policy actors. In relation to this case study, that model is formal primary schooling, accepted irrespective of developing country context. In these circumstances it would have been more difficult to exclude universal primary education than to include it.

There is also a suggestion from a world society theory perspective that educational structures and curricular content are institutionalized at the world level. According to this perspective these “undermine the impact of national and local factors in determining the composition of the curriculum” (Meyer *as cited in* Dale 2000, p. 432). A consequence of the convergent educational policy priorities is that even disputes regarding curriculum inquiry are built around a strikingly shared vision (Dale 2000).

Hall’s work adds an interesting dimension to this. He proposes that policy processes operate within a dominant paradigm. The policy process “can be structured by a particular set of ideas, just as it can be structured by a set of institutions” (1993, p. 290). Thus policy actors “are likely to be in a stronger position to resist pressure from societal interests when they are armed with a coherent policy paradigm” (p. 290). At the same time the policy process includes the effects of societal forces and therefore is “a struggle for power” (Hall 1993, p. 292). In this way the process is highly dynamic and interactive. Policy actors face uncertainty, are not certain of what they should do and learn in the process. Elster’s view (1994) is that social norms affect rational policy processes and that there are consequences for policy actors in choosing whether or

not to work within those norms. This is relevant to MDG2 because essentially the dominant social and economic policy paradigm had emphasised equal opportunity as opposed to equal outcomes (as per Heidenheimer 1982). The provision of equal opportunity, on the surface at least, is the dominant policy paradigm of the MDGs. MDG2 fits well in this paradigm.

Although again, even though many countries may have similar education policy priorities, this does not mean that the policies are implemented at the school level. Also, because policies are encoded in very similar ways in different locations, this does not mean that they are decoded or understood in similar ways. So what is implied and understood by universal primary education would vary between policy actors and between nation-states.

These world society theory perspectives lead to our third hypothesis, that:

Policy actors used a rational policy process, or at least the appearance of a rational process, which then dominated international relations. MDG2 was accepted with a remarkable consensus, despite the remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances of nation-states. Given that universal primary education had been a widely accepted policy priority for many years in established and powerful nation states embracing the Western hegemony and in the UN, it was not surprising that universal primary education was taken for granted by elite policy actors as a good policy for developing nations.

The table below shows indicators used to assess the world society theory hypothesis.

Table 2.3: *Indicators* used to assess the world society theory hypothesis

1.	<i>Policy actors used a rational policy process, or at least the appearance of a rational process.</i>
2.	<i>Policy values, norms and practices are those of Western modernity, including progress, justice and associated ideas of the state and the individual. Strong influence of neo-liberal priorities to justify the policy.</i>
3.	<i>UN as taken for granted forum for global policy decisions.</i>
4.	<i>The presence of coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism.</i>

5.	<i>A taken for granted-ness and remarkable consensus about universal primary education as a policy priority by decisions makers. Therefore a common sense choice without evidence of rational consideration of alternatives.</i>
6.	<i>Little or no consideration of remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances between nation-states.</i>
7.	<i>Professionalization of the field. Similar academic credentials and backgrounds of powerful policy actors. Therefore isomorphism of policy views, approaches and outcomes and crucial role of development professionals as policy elite determining policy outcomes.</i>
8.	<i>Uncritical acceptance of policy priorities that may be contradictory.</i>
9.	<i>UN as perpetuator and subject of widely accepted world society culture, reflective of Western hegemony</i>
10.	<i>A worldwide, macro-phenomenological view of policy priorities.</i>

## Summary

The three theories have been used to generate predictions regarding how and why MDG2 came to be selected. From a rational synoptic perspective MDG2 would have been selected as a part of a rational policy process to reverse the grinding poverty, hunger and disease affecting millions. The policy process would have engaged specialists in providing reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas. From a critical theory perspective MDG2 would have been selected as part of an undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process. It would represent a downward revision of 1990's EFA targets, diverting resources away from secondary and higher education, relegating poorer countries to the intellectual periphery and making them less able to compete on world markets. Therefore MDG2 did not represent world opinion, rather it reinforced the UN's role as part of a ruling apparatus and reinforced the existing ruling hegemony. From a world society theory perspective MDG2 would have been accepted with a remarkable consensus, despite the remarkably different economic, political and cultural differences between nation-states. Given that universal primary education had been a widely accepted policy priority and education model for many years in established and powerful nation states it was not surprising that universal primary education was taken for granted by elite policy actors as a good policy and a good model of education for developing nations.

## **3. Method**

This chapter outlines the approach taken to address the research question. First the chapter discusses the ontological and epistemological foundations of the study. It shows why case study is an appropriate method for the research question. The chapter then defines and bounds the case and explains the approach to data collection and analysis. Then the particular approach to research ethics is outlined. The strengths and weaknesses of this case study are not discussed in this chapter, rather in the concluding chapter.

### **3.1 Ontology and epistemology**

Ontology and epistemology influence “the way that data are collected and analysed about the social world” (Scott 2005, p. 634). They affect the research method, analysis and findings.

The term ontology is taken here to mean “a vision of the world as it really is, a more or less coherent set of assumptions about how the world works” (Gerring 2004, p. 351). An underlying assumption of this research is that a reality independent of the observer exists. As actors in this reality we are part of the social world, we are affected by it and we affect it. This grounds the research as an action setting out to affect the social world and therefore has a transformative purpose. These assumptions underlie the view that we can know something of reality, yet that absolute knowledge of reality is not possible (Scott 2005). Therefore a naïve positivist assumption that absolute knowledge of the social world is possible is rejected (Scott 2005). Yet an absolute relativist assumption, that nothing reliable can be known, is also rejected. Rather the ontological assumptions lead to a pragmatic position that partial knowledge is both possible and useful.

The relationship between structure and agency is also an ontological consideration. A Marxist position would foreground structure as the most powerful influence on human behaviour and social life, whilst a rational synoptic approach would foreground agency. Again, the pragmatic view on which this study is based is that both structure and

agency have effects (Bhaskar & Callinicos 2003). Both are considered.

Epistemology explores our way of knowing. It explores the nature of relationship between the knower (the inquirer) and the known (or knowable) (Gough 2002). An epistemological framework underlying this research is critical realism. Critical realism takes as a starting point that objects exist, whether they are known by someone to exist or not (Scott 2005). The social world and the natural world are meaningful (Bhaskar and Callinicos 2003). Yet we cannot claim absolute knowledge of the way the world works because of our intellectual limitations and a notion of error. Critical realism operates with acknowledgement of fallibility, in the sense that we “are always one step behind the evolving and emergent nature of the social world” (Scott 2005, p. 636). We are not pursuing objectivity, which “is a form of alienation from our true selves and from nature” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 18). Yet we are introducing notions of objectivity and a level of reliability via systematic internal critique (Scott 2005). So this research inquiry takes the pragmatic view that systematic approaches to knowing are a way of generating reliable and helpful findings, but fallible findings nonetheless (Cohen et al 2007, Scott 2005). In this study the causes of MDG2’s selection are established by inference.

### **3.2 The case study method**

This research uses a single case study method to trace a policy process (Gerring 2004). The process for MDG2’s selection occurred over a period of time, therefore this case study traces that policy process over time. Process tracing explores “the chain of events or the decision-making process by which initial case conditions (were)... translated into case outcomes” (Van Evera 1997, p. 74). Determining when the process started was not simple, as universal primary education has been a UN policy priority since the *Declaration of Human Rights* (UNGA 1948).

There are numerous advantages of using the case study method for answering this particular research question. Case study is a preferred method for development of causal explanations (Yin 2014). Case study is also effective in establishing cause (Van Evera 1997), particularly in defining how an independent variable (such as the



Millennium Summit) can cause a dependent variable (such as the *Millennium Declaration*).

Case study is also an appropriate design for this research question because it does not stipulate methods of analysis. Case studies can work at several levels of analysis simultaneously and are flexible. They cope well with ambiguity and complexity as these are “intrinsic to the enterprise” (Gerring 2004, p. 341). So this flexibility, as difficult as it has proven to be, was essential because of the exceptional complexity of the policy process. Such complex processes are not reducible to simple descriptions (Cohen et al 2007) and case study was appropriate “to understand complex social phenomena” (Yin 2014, p. 4), to illuminate a decision or set of decisions and trace operational links over time “rather than mere frequencies or incidence” (Yin 2014, p. 10).

Establishing cause was difficult. Although Van Evera proposes that “The investigator traces backward the causal process that produces the case outcome, at each stage inferring the context that caused each cause (and this)... leads the investigator back to a prime cause” (p. 70), this case study departs from Van Evera on this point.

Establishing a prime cause was not possible. There was a complex web of causes in MDG2’s selection. It was a complex phenomena rather than a “linear, deterministic, patterned, universalizable... closed like system which may be operating in the laboratory but which do not operate in the social world” (Cohen et al 2007, pp. 33-34).

### **3.3 Defining and bounding the case study**

The case study needed to be carefully defined and bound, because to describe everything about such a complex case “is impossible, there must be a focus” (de Vaus 2001, pp. 224-225). I defined the time frame, defined who or what people and organisations would be considered, and what policy texts and other data sources would be included. As the case study progressed, almost inevitably, these boundaries expanded. Initially the time boundaries for the case study were 2000 to 2005. Based on information on UN and Millennium Project websites an incorrect assumption was made that MDG2 had been accepted by the General Assembly sometime during that period. Systematic and careful study of the policy process revealed that most of what

was included in the final list of MDGs was already in a policy text by OECD DAC in 1996. Also at a World Summit in 2005 there was no evidence that the UN General Assembly had accepted a list of 8 MDGs as the policy. The evidence was to the contrary. There were further changes to the MDGs in 2007. So the time boundaries for the case study expanded backward and forward.

It was also necessary to bound the case study by defining who or what constituted the unit of analysis because “additional units always loom in the background” (Gerring 2004). The UN MDG policy process was the key unit of analysis. Yet complexity of the UN and the policy process made it a challenge to bound and define. So the UN had to be examined and referred to in categories. These were mainly the UN General Assembly and the UN Secretariat. Yet sometimes the term UN was also used to mean the entire UN family including main organs, funds, programmes and specialised agencies (UN 2015a). At all times this study attempts to make clear which UN is being referred to.

What constituted the policy also had to be defined and bound. For the purposes of this study MDG2 is considered to be the policy text as expressed in the various UN and related texts between 1996 and 2008 that are included in this study. Although what constitutes a policy in practice is more complex, but this study was only looking at MDG2's selection so did not consider this.

During the study data gathering came to a point of saturation (Given 2008) where new data was confirming what had already been found and no new insights were emerging. At that point I moved to findings and drew conclusions. Although there was an exception, one aspect of the policy process continued to give conflicting accounts. That was the extent to which the Secretary General, Kofi Annan, knew about the *Road Map Annex*, containing a refined list of 8 MDGs. Feedback from policy actors on a draft of this research inquiry helped clarify this matter. Accounts still appeared to conflict, but to a lesser extent.

### 3.4 Data collection

Case study is not equated with any particular method for data collection. So the particular approach to data collection in this study is a set of instruments designed for the purposes of this particular research question (Sarantakos 2005). This study “relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion” (Yin 2014, p. 17). Given the complexity of the UN and its decision-making processes, there are enormous bodies of data. At the outset the design imposed limits on the number and scale of data sources. Almost unavoidably these limits were broken. Below is an outline of data sources, the limits and methods of recording.

#### 3.4.1 MDG2 policy texts and discourses

This study was designed, primarily, based on policy text analysis. Therefore data collection was focussed on MDG policy texts. These were the *Millennium Declaration* (2000), the *Road Map* (2001), the *Road Map Annex* (2001), the *Practical Plan to Achieving the MDGs* (2005) and the *World Summit Outcome* (2005). Later, when discovering that universal primary education was in OECD DAC’s *Shaping the 21st Century* (1996) and *A Better World for All* (2000), these were also included. Texts were carefully and systematically coded. Subsequently other texts were included, such as *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (1948), the outcome of the UN High Level Event *Committing to action: achieving the Millennium Development Goals* (2008) and the Outcome of UN General Assembly Session on the MDGs *Keeping the Promise* (2010). Goals and targets were tracked, mapped and recorded in tables (See Appendices 3 and 4). New additions to MDG targets occurred as late as 2007.

Records of the policy discourse were contained in verbatim records of UN gatherings and on UN and other multilateral agency websites and media reports. The level of reliability of UN and other multilateral agency websites was lower in comparison with policy texts and verbatim records, but careful data triangulation countered this. Inaccurate versions of events were also revealing, leading to further avenues for exploration.

#### 3.4.2 Policy actor interviews

This study was designed on the assumption that access to elite policy actors would be unlikely. Given that I had no contacts within the UN or associated organisations I was

not in a position to establish a pool of potential interviewees. Rather the aim was to interview whatever MDG policy actors from the inner circle that I could get access to. A co-presenter at a conference gave me the contact details of an inner circle MDG policy actor. I interviewed that policy actor. He/she then gave me the names of other policy actors. Some of these agreed to be interviewed. That first interviewee also named a person who I should probably not interview because this person “had moved on”. Contrary to the first interviewee’s advice, I contacted this person and interviewed them, suspecting he/she may give a different version of events. As it turned their version of events was almost identical to the first interviewee’s. An advisor from the University of Bath provided the contact details of a key policy actor in the EFA process. This policy actor was interviewed, giving insight into the broader historical process around universal primary education. This interviewee also referred me to two further policy actors who I subsequently interviewed.

So interviews were obtained from three policy actors who were in the inner circle of those instrumental in selecting the MDGs. A fourth policy actor from this inner circle provided information via email. Other interviewees were able to give insight more broadly on the long-standing UN commitment to universal primary education. One was instrumental in a Millennium Project in cooperation with UN University, preceding the UN Millennium Summit. Three interviewees were researchers and policy actors in the inner circle of UN and related policy processes. These were in organisations such as UNICEF, UNESCO and the EFA process. One further interviewee was a key policy actor in a national education policy board that was part of the UN family. Finally, one researcher was interviewed who had studied a similar process in relation to the UN and The World Bank. In total there were nine interviewees and one policy actor who responded to the research question via email.

Access to these policy actors was unexpected. Walford (1994) suggested that already having links, and having been shown to be fair and reputable in the past could help considerably with gaining access to interviewees. This proved to be the case, as access to one policy actor led to another. When I discussed my surprise at gaining access to interviewees, one stated “It’s because we care” (Tony) and that matched my observations. These are an impressive group of people.

The research question was provided to interviewees at least a week prior. Interviews had a basic structure, but as little as possible to start discussing the question. The emphasis was on less rather than more structure. I first outlined the purpose of the research to the interviewee, stated that comments were not for attribution. Then I outlined the interview method. Once the interviewees agreed to proceed I asked them the research question: 'How and why did MDG2 come to be selected as a priority in the UN Millennium Project?' We had a purposeful and usually lengthy conversation. This approach allowed me to explore the question deeply with the interviewee. It allowed me to "uncover new clues, to open up new dimensions of a problem and to secure vivid, accurate, inclusive accounts from informants that are based on personal experience" (Burgess 1982, p. 108). I wanted interviewees to speak naturally and to say what came to mind. It was vital that interviewees were allowed to "talk in their own terms" (Burgess, p. 108). Often the natural flow of what they said was revealing. Following discussion of the research question I presented each hypotheses, one at a time, and asked for their response. This engendered further purposeful conversation. Interviewee responses to the hypotheses were sharp and insightful. I also had a set of questions prepared prior to the interview. Sometimes I asked these questions, sometimes not. I based that decision on what had been covered in the interview and a gut feeling on maintaining the open conversation. I took hand written notes rather than recording the interviews, to give a level of security to interviewees. Although most said they would be happy to be quoted, still this study uses anonymous names. An advanced draft of this research inquiry was sent to all interviewees for comment prior to submission. Three responded and their feedback was accommodated. Interestingly, two indicated that the study had led them to think critically about the policy process and their role in it. This study aims to help policy actors better understand the policy process. The fact that interviewees reflected on the process during interviews and subsequently by reading a draft of this study shows that the aim is being realised, even if on a small scale.

There were particular considerations for these interviews because they were with elite policy actors. People in powerful positions are often expert at presenting themselves, their actions and their intentions in a favourable light. They are also expert at controlling the agenda. So I could have quickly found myself being led away from

topics that I wished to explore (Walford 1994, Richards 2005). There were differences between accounts. Also, I was expecting that interviewees would test my knowledge of the field. Most interviewees did this, but I was well prepared. A list of interviewees is included in the introductory section of this research inquiry.

Observations regarding the setting, structure, atmosphere and procedures of the interview were also important. These were recorded in the research log following each interview (Walford 2009).

### **3.4.3 Research log**

A research log details the journey taken and helps validate the researcher's analysis (Richards 2005). It assesses directions the researcher took and helps analyse how the researcher ended up with particular outcomes. Therefore a research log was kept. It was primarily a record of handling data, outlining why certain directions were taken and why others were not. It recorded notes on written sources, interviews, the natural history of the research and my thoughts in relation to the research goals. Also it helped me understand how I influenced data. There were times when data seemed to be pointing in different directions. Using the research log as a means of recording those reflections helped bring them together into more unified findings, or least clarified new questions.

## **3.5 Coding**

Careful coding was an important and valuable technique in this research. I coded policy texts manually. Whilst time consuming, this gave excellent insight into themes and priorities. A verbatim record of a UN General Assembly session on the *Road Map* was also coded. This revealed a variety of views by nation state representatives regarding the *Millennium Declaration* and proved that in 2001 the General Assembly had not voted on a refined list of MDGs. In the latter stages of the research, interviews with elite policy actors were coded. This was done to see if there was a difference between the stated reasons for selecting the MDGs in policy texts and the stated reason for selecting the MDGs by policy actors. There was a difference.

I also traced development priorities/goals identified in policy texts. The first text was OECD-DAC's *Shaping the 21st Century* (2006). Then *A Better World for All* (2000), the

*Millennium Declaration* (2000), the *Road Map* (2001), *Road Map Annex* (2001) and the final form of the MDGs from 2007 onward. Tracing the priorities/goals helped track priorities that eventually became the MDGs. It showed that most of the priorities agreed to unanimously by world leaders at the Millennium Summit were set aside by elite policy actors and only some became MDGs, establishing a particular global policy architecture.

### **3.6 Data analysis and findings**

The purpose of data analysis was to look for congruence between data and to answer the research question as “unambiguously as possible” (de Vaus 2001, p. 9). It was not possible to establish a definitive causal explanation because the selection of MDG2 happened as part of a complex social phenomenon. So this study aimed for a systematic and reliable approach to data analysis, seeking compelling evidence to establish a probable explanation. This case study aims to tell “a plausible, convincing, and logically acceptable story of how events unfold and how they are linked to one another” (de Vaus 2001, p. 236).

As a study of an historical process the first practical step in organising data and data analysis was producing a clear and detailed “sequence in which events took place and of the context in which they occurred” (de Vaus 2001, p. 228). Producing the sequence of events continued throughout the case study in recursive loops. In regards to data analysis, the sequence of events either confirmed or contradicted the hypotheses, thereby testing theoretical propositions. There were conflicting accounts, but the use of multiple data sources helped reduce the effect of such problems, building greater validity (de Vaus 2001). The conflicting accounts sometimes led to deeper insights. Due to word count limitations the sequence of events was deleted from this dissertation, but a summarised version is included as Table 4.1.

Given that the study was designed and carried out primarily as a policy text analysis, an analysis tool was required. So critical discourse analysis (CDA) was used to analyse policy texts. CDA is located within critical research and critical realism paradigms. The purpose of CDA “Is to disarticulate and to critique texts as a way of disrupting common sense” (Luke 1996, p. 20). Its strength “Lies in its capacity to show

the power relations of apparently mundane texts at work” (Luke 1996, p. 40). The CDA method developed by Fairclough (2003) was adapted and applied in a systematic manner to this study. Fairclough (2003) presents a series of questions at the end of each chapter in his book. Those questions were used to analyse each key policy text in this study. I also added additional questions. CDA results are presented in Appendix 1. CDA was helpful in analysing themes within policy texts and comparing themes between policy texts. It revealed trends in the policy process and helped connect policy priorities with particular groupings of policy actors. It also revealed the growing prominence of neo-liberal and new public management paradigms. Yet, not surprisingly, there is a level of subjectivity to the CDA method. The questions themselves frame what is explored and what is not explored. My answers were also framed by my reading of the text and my theoretical and ideological assumptions. This is normal in policy analysis. But the advantage to CDA was that it forced me to ask questions of every text that I might not otherwise have considered.

After outlining the sequence of events, and CDA, I mapped associations and connections of policy actors and other influencing factors through the policy process, creating what de Vaus refers to as an interrelated causal chain (2001). This technique was useful because of the complex nature of the causal associations and complex causal explanations. The map became so complex as to be unworkable and had to be abandoned. Yet even that supported the finding regarding the complex and opaque nature of the policy process.

Interviews occurred in the latter stages of data gathering. So at the same time as the interviews were happening I started to generate findings. I read back over the sequence of events, map of associations and connections, CDA, coding, tracking of priorities in UN policy texts and discourses, other historical sources, interview data and the literature. I looked for patterns and correlations. In a practical sense, this meant one piece of paper per emerging finding, on which I included relevant data in the form of a mind map. I also started writing up the findings quite early. Findings were revised and sharpened numerous times. The writing process forced me to refine my thinking and allowed advisers to read and give feedback. So there was a systematic structure of carefully going through each data source, but the process of generating findings also had an organic element to it.



CDA was not applied to interview data. In part this was because interviews were not recorded (to help elite policy actors speak openly). So if CDA were applied to interviews it would have been applied to interview notes rather than an interview transcript. Also, because the study was designed as primarily a study of policy texts, interviews were anticipated to be a validity check. As such CDA was not seen as a necessary tool, although new data came to light, so interviews ended up being more than a validity check. Interview notes were coded, themes added to qualitative and quantitative analysis and were used to generate and sharpen findings.

In relation to the findings this study did not aim and was not able to establish invariant causal relationships. An example would be the proposition that when the World Bank and IMF (IFIs) get involved in a policy process, the neo-liberal agenda always becomes more prominent. To prove that as an invariant relationship would require me to establish that neo-liberal policy priorities follow in all instances when the IFIs become involved in policy processes. Also it is naïve to think that the IFIs have one unified policy position (Psacharopoulos 2006). Even the relatively small group that decided the contents of the *Road Map Annex* disagreed with one another (Luca, Paul). Also, because this was a study of an open system I could not isolate and test variables— such as in the natural sciences. So relations, structure, behaviour, setting were all likely to change over time (Scott 2005).

Abductive reasoning was used to move from factual premise to explanatory conclusion to inference. According to Pierce (*as cited in* Haig 2005) a sound abductive argument can lead one to the conclusion that the claim might be true, but not beyond that. However, I disagree with Pierce on this point. Multiple data sources, confirming a particular explanation, can lead to valid and defensible findings, which is a stronger position than saying that a finding might be true.

### **3.7 Validity, triangulation and reliability**

To achieve validity, the method aimed to be systematic, thorough, using multiple data sources and multiple analysis techniques, converging to reach defensible findings. The study used a method of moving from theory to hypothesis, to findings, to

hypothesis testing and then back to theory. Coding and analysis of themes was systematic and carefully re-checked. Alongside hypothesis testing the study also used critical theory and CDA. This was the more organic aspect of the research, gradually refining and sharpening findings in progressive iterations of the dissertation. The position taken in this study is that this approach built validity and reliability by the convergence of findings through different research methods. Although, there were also tensions. These are discussed in the concluding chapter.

Data triangulation was important in ensuring that findings were validated from a number of sources (Yin 2014). In regards to how many sources were required, Richards (2005) suggests that we need enough data to provide good answers and we know we have enough when we start to get the same answers repeatedly. That is what happened in this study. Data from multiple sources have been used, analysed and brought together to ensure validity. However there were complexities with this, as it is possible that even if the same information was provided by a number of sources, it may still have been incorrect. This was managed by looking across a range of data, including only parts of the sequence of events that made sense in light of other information. And by excluding parts of the sequence that did not make sense in light of other information. For example, the claim that world leaders selected the MDGs at the Millennium Summit (2000) is repeated in multiple sources (UN 2014b, UN Secretary General 2001, 2005). Yet careful examination of the policy texts, the sequence of events, transcript of a General Assembly Debate (2001) and interviews prove that frequently repeated claim to be incorrect.

Proving reliability of findings in this case study was important. Data analysis also sought to disprove causal relationships. As Yin (2014) points out, just because Y follows X it does not mean that X is the cause of Y; there may be latent variables that cause Y. Therefore what remained as a result of careful analysis was the most probable causal relationships. In terms of reliability, another researcher repeating the same study should arrive at the same or very similar findings (Yin 2014) regarding *how* MDG2 was selected. Although in regards to the *why* MDG2 was selected, it is unlikely that another researcher would reach the same findings. This is because the findings are caught up in my particular formulation of the theoretical frameworks for this study. Explaining *why* MDG2 was selected is also caught up in my own ontological and

epistemological assumptions. This is the reality of studying human behaviour “where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 11). So this study uses multiple sources of data, a clear and systematic approach, careful analysis and establishing probable causal relationships to reach reliable, useful and defensible findings.

Interview data were used to validate or contradict written sources. As the research was designed primarily based on policy text and written source analysis interviews were an unexpected (and welcome) addition. There were even occasions when important information regarding the policy process came from only one interviewee. At all times this study attempts to make clear the level of reliability and who said what, even if only one source. An example of this is a meeting between a high-ranking member of the UN Secretariat and two elite policy actors, to discuss controversial aspects of the policy process. One interviewee gave in depth information about the meeting, another confirmed that the meeting occurred but gave no further information. So this study makes clear that the meeting most likely occurred, infers what happened from one interviewee’s input, but also makes clear that the information is based only on one interviewee’s account. Also other data, including a General Assembly debate, made clear to me why one interviewee would not want the information to go public, as it would have called into question the motivations of a high-ranking member of the UN Secretariat. But discussing those details in this study would have compromised interviewee anonymity and rights.

Close to the completion of this research inquiry I went back one final time through all literature summaries, the sequence of events, CDA, coding, tracking of priorities in UN policy texts and discourses, other historical sources and interview data and coding. This was to check that nothing had been missed and to check yet again that findings were validated by data. Whilst nothing new emerged from this re-check, it reinforced findings and confirmed reliability.

In regards to external validity, case studies in general are not in as strong a position. External validity is a measure of the extent to which findings are valid beyond the bounds of the study and the extent to which analytic generalizations are valid (Yin

2014). So I reached findings that provide systematic and adequate generalizations for this particular case, but not necessarily beyond this particular case. In part, this is because the UN is complex and changes, and also because the study refers to a particular time period. However, even as this study is being completed, the 2015 Sustainable Development Goals policy process is underway (UN 2015). As the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs 2015-2030) effectively follow the MDGs, the findings of this study are relevant to the SDG policy process. As interesting as this is, discussion of the connection between the MDG and SDG process are limited to only brief comments and preliminary recommendations in the conclusion, as the SDGs are not the focus of this research question.

### **3.8 Implications for theory**

The research goal, in relation to theory, was to ascertain the extent to which each hypothesis and related theory explained the selection of MDG2. In the previous chapter theories were explained and expectations provided regarding what we should see if the hypotheses were valid. The three hypotheses were systematically tested in light of data (Van Evera 1997). Due to the fact that each of the three hypotheses was grounded in a particular theory, hypothesis testing included theory testing. There were also aspects of the policy process that were not explained by the three hypotheses. So the study sought plausible rival explanations and proposed other theory paradigms that might shed light on the policy process (Complexity and systems theories). So theory testing was at the heart of this case study (de Vaus 2001, Yin 1989, Yin 2014). Although as study of a single process, its findings in relation to theory are not generalizable beyond it.

As part of a commitment to being systematic and rigorous, this study looked for evidence to disprove the three hypotheses. None were entirely disproven. Although one, the world society theory hypothesis, correlated most closely with what happened. Still the rational synoptic and critical hypotheses shed light on aspects of the policy process that world society theory did not. Critical theory was the most helpful in constructing alternatives and providing suggestions for the SDG policy process.

### **3.9 Presenting the results**

According to de Vaus (2001) findings must be distilled and presented in a concise and readable form. Given vast data regarding a global policy process, this was a challenge. Findings were presented as concisely as possible. In Chapter 5 findings were used to evaluate the plausibility of each hypothesis. Due to the sheer volume of data, much was included in appendices and summarised in tables. This was necessary to show evidence for the findings, to keep within the word limit and to make this dissertation readable.

### **3.10 Ethical considerations**

The ethical approach was based on the British Educational Research Association Guidelines (2011). There is an ethic of respect for persons involved in the research as interviewees and policy actors in the MDG2 policy process. People were treated fairly, with dignity, respect and free from prejudice. At the same time, public policies and organisations are and should be open to critique, for the purpose of transformation and improvement. The current number of people living on less than \$1.25 per day is estimated at 836 million (United Nations 2015c). People living in poverty, who had little or no say at all in MDG selection, are also deserving of dignity and respect. Given that the MDGs claimed to be a poverty reduction strategy, the rights of people living in poverty cannot be compromised for fear of critiquing the policy process or policy actors. The aim of critique is transformative, to make the findings available to policy actors in clear, straightforward language, so that they might gain from it.

Being careful, thorough and systematic was also an important ethical action because this research should be reliable. There were times during the research process that it was not possible to foresee what the findings would be or to what extent the hypotheses were valid. I was open to what would emerge. Due to the subjective nature of historical inquiry, findings were carefully qualified. One of the real challenges was struggling with establishing the motivations of development professionals. Whether they were consciously or unconsciously looking after their own interests, combatting poverty, or both.

The purpose of the study was made clear to interviewees and they gave voluntary informed consent prior to the interview. Participants were guaranteed that their comments would not be attributed to them. They had the right to withdraw from the interview at any time, and were given an advanced draft of this research inquiry for comment prior to submission. Adjustments to this dissertation were made based on these comments. Interview records are stored securely. Yet interviewees themselves were self reflective and critical of aspects of the process. The findings also recognise the significant achievements of the MDGs and elite policy actors. They have devoted their professional lives to eliminating poverty.

### **Summary**

This chapter outlined the ontology and epistemology of the research design, grounded in critical realism. In this epistemological framework I do not claim absolute knowledge of the policy process, yet introduce notions of objectivity and truth via the idea of broad data gathering, systematic and comprehensive processes and internal critique. This is a pragmatic approach, aiming to reach strong and defensible findings in relation to the selection of MDG2, findings that aim to be of use to policy actors.

## 4. Findings

This chapter discusses findings. At the outset, it is important to establish that this case study does not claim to have found all of the reasons for MDG2's selection. Policy processes are continually in motion, organic and unpredictable (Hall 1993). As an historical study it is reliant on differing accounts. In spite of these caveats, the chapter presents reliable and defensible findings. It shows that the MDGs were selected in the context of global challenges and opportunities as well as to focus and strengthen the UN. It shows a remarkable consensus among policy actors regarding the selection of universal primary education. It also shows that the policy process was complex and opaque. Elite policy actors were crucial in the selection of MDG2 and it was they who decided to include it in the *Road Map Annex* (2001), a crucial policy text. Linked to this were the pivotal role of the 'economic side' in determining priorities and the almost total absence of developing country and education community voices. Finally the chapter shows that selection of a limited number of measurable goals, including MDG2, was widely regarded by elite policy actors as an effective strategy.

Prior to discussing those findings however, a brief summary of key events is provided in the table below. Given the complexity of the policy process, this aims to help the reader understand the sequence of events and where key policy texts fit within that sequence.

Table 4.1: Brief summary of key events and identification of policy texts

Year	Events/ Policy texts
1948	<i>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</i> : includes universal primary education as human right.
1960's	First UN Decade of Development: includes universal primary education.  <i>UNESCO's Convention against Discrimination in Education</i> declared that all nation-states must "Make primary education free and compulsory" (article 4a).

1970's	Second Decade of Development: includes universal primary education (UNGA 1970).
1980's	Jim Grant (Executive Director UNICEF) and Richard Jolly (Deputy Executive Director UNICEF) approach UNESCO to commit to universal primary education. UNESCO did not commit. Jim Grant persuaded Robert McNamara (Head of World Bank) to support child development goals. This set the foundation for UNICEF, UNESCO, UNDP and the World Bank to support a world conference on education at Jomtien (Giancarlo).
1990	The World Conference on Education For All, Jomtien, Thailand (UNESCO 2013, UNESCO 2014). Identified basic learning needs for all. The Bank and some international agencies preferred universal primary education, but did not get it as single agreed global policy priority (Max).
1992	Millennium Project initiated by UN University. An ongoing system bringing experts together for the improvement of futures research and its application to the policy process (Gordon & Glenn 1994, Tony). Not the same as the UN Millennium Project, starting in 2001, commissioned by UN Secretary General (Tony).
1995	World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen (UN 1995). G77 rejected setting global targets for poverty reduction. Said developing countries should develop at own pace (Luca).
1996	OECD DAC published a set of six global development goals in <i>Shaping the 21st Century</i> (1996): Includes universal primary education.
1997	Kofi Annan appointed as UN Secretary General. Identified UN reform as major priority and initiated closer cooperation with World Bank, IMF and private sector (Annan 2012).  Secretary General gained approval for UN Millennium Assembly (agenda item A/RES/52/12, <i>Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform</i> ).
2000	March: UN Secretary General issued <i>We the Peoples: The role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century</i> . Includes universal primary education within set of International Development Goals (IDGs) almost identical to OECD-DAC's goals of 1996.



	<p>April: World Education Forum Dakar (2000). Universal primary education one of the six major goals agreed to. Again World Bank wanted universal primary education as the one shared fast track global priority but did not get it (Max).</p> <p>June/July: The World Summit on Social Development Geneva (UN DESA 2014). Policy text <i>A Better World for All</i> issued jointly by World Bank, OECD DAC, IMF and UN Secretary-General. Included seven international development goals including universal primary education. Controversial text reacted against by some as neo-liberal propaganda (Luca, Raiser 2000).</p> <p>September: Millennium Summit at UN headquarters in New York, attended by “149 Heads of State and Government and high-ranking officials from over 40 other countries” (UN 2014a). Unanimously agreed to <i>Millennium Declaration</i>. Includes universal primary education.</p> <p>December: UN General Assembly agreed that Secretary General should prepare a road map for implementation of the UNMD.</p>
2001	<p>January: Michael Doyle (Assistant UN Secretary General) appointed by Secretary General to lead development of <i>Road Map</i> (Paul).</p> <p>January/February: Jan Vandemoortele (Chief of Social Policy UNICEF) and Michael Doyle agreed to assemble a group of technical experts to develop refined list of goals and targets. Concerned that <i>Millennium Declaration</i> contained too many priorities and unachievable (Luca, Paul).</p> <p>March: Technical experts from OECD, IMF, World Bank, UNDP, DESA, UNICEF, UNFPA gathered (Luca, Paul, Hayley). Developed <i>Road Map Annex</i>. Contained list of 8 goals and associated targets that became the MDGs. Conflicting accounts as to Secretary General’s knowledge of this.</p> <p>November: <i>Road Map</i> and <i>Road Map Annex</i> debated at General Assembly.</p>
2002	<p>EFA Fast-Track Initiative launched. Encouraged low-income countries to develop national education plans and commit political and financial resources. In exchange donor countries committed to providing funding and expertise (UNESCO 2015b).</p>

	United Nations Millennium Project commissioned by Secretary General to develop concrete action plan for delivering the MDGs.
2005	<p>January: the UN Millennium Project released <i>Investing in Development: A practical plan to achieve the Millennium Development Goals</i>.</p> <p>March: <i>In Larger Freedom</i> (2005) by Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, released in preparation for the World Summit (2005). Conflates the <i>Millennium Declaration</i> (2000) with the <i>Road Map Annex</i> (2001), thus giving the false impression that the refined list of 8 goals and 18 targets were agreed to by world leaders at the Millennium Summit.</p> <p>October: The World Summit evaluated global situation. In A/RES/60/1 there is discussion of MDGs as a subset but not replacement of agreed development priorities in UNMD.</p>
2007	MDG monitoring framework revised. New targets included: reducing biodiversity loss, access to reproductive health. Excluded: more generous official development assistance, tariff and quota free access for least developed country exports, enhanced programme debt relief for HIPC, cancellation of official bilateral debt (World Bank 2014).

## 4.1 Global challenges and opportunities

“By the end of the 1990’s... over 60% of the world’s population subsisted on \$2 or less per day; over 1 billion people were living on less than \$1 per day... and 1.3 billion lacked even the most basic health, sanitation, and education services”  
(Annan 2012, p. 215).

MDG policy texts situate the MDGs as a response to global challenges and opportunities. *Shaping the 21st Century* (1996) by OECD DAC, is the first text containing a set of goals almost identical to the MDGs. It discusses the proportion of global population living in developing countries (80%), the number living in poverty (over 1 billion), infrastructure issues, the need for good governance, the need to move away from aid dependence, and the need for active participation of all members of the international community. It also discusses globalization, population growth, economic

interdependence and growing similarities in policy priorities and approaches across all countries. Likewise *We the Peoples* (2000), *A Better World for All* (2000), the *Millennium Declaration* (2000), the *Road Map* (2001) and *Investing in Development* (2005) all situate development goals in relation to broader global challenges and opportunities.

Kofi Annan (2012), in his memoirs, situates MDG selection in light of global challenges and opportunities. For Annan the development decades of the 60's and 70's were "overshadowed by the Cold War" (p. 213). With "the threat of a global nuclear holocaust- few resources were available to improve the lives of the developing world" (p. 213). Debate between "the capitalist, Western view, and the socialist and communist view of economic and social development" (p. 214) made it difficult to enact "any single development agenda" (p. 214). With the end of the Cold War the door was open for development and for developing countries to come to the centre of UN policy priorities (Annan 2012). Annan also said that in the mid to late 90s it was obvious that "Globalization was not lifting all boats- not by any stretch of the imagination. Instead the opposite was happening for many" (p. 215). Despite the "terrible figures on global poverty, there was no sign of urgency among member states to commit even a slight fraction of the resources and effort necessary to face this global tragedy" (2012, p. 215).

Policy actors interviewed also situated MDGs in light of global challenges and opportunities. Luca said developing countries thought "It's our turn" and put pressure on the international community to support development. Tim talked about the "post cold war" 1990's as a seminal moment for developing agreed global goals. "There was an opening... That is where all of the agreements of the 1990's came from" (Tim). Max spoke about a global policy context in 2000 that was more conducive to global agreements than now. Claudia also situated the MDGs in the context of global challenges and opportunities, but more so as part of a well-organised strategy to maintain the status quo of global power relations and distribution of wealth.

Although not all interviewees emphasised global challenges and opportunities as the reason for selecting the MDGs. Hayley (High ranking member of UN Secretariat) situated the selection of MDGs in relation to UN agreements. Paul (inner circle of

policy actors) also spoke mostly about UN agreements. To be fair, these interviewees may have assumed the global context as a taken for granted reason for selecting the MDGs. Nevertheless, when asked how and why MDG2 came to be selected Paul and Hayley spoke mostly about the UN and UN policy processes.

None of the texts, nor elite MDG policy actors, discussed how education would meet global challenges and opportunities. There was an assumption that education was central to a multi-dimensional approach to development and the particular type of education proposed was following a well-established (Western) model. Yet there was no discussion of how universal primary education in particular would address global challenges and opportunities.

It is clear also that, whilst there was consideration of global challenges and opportunities, there is no evidence that this was done in a comprehensive, rational, synoptic study as a formal part of the policy process to select the refined list of MDGs for the *Road Map Annex*. Rather there was an assumption that agreements of the 1990's were based on global challenges and opportunities and that the *Millennium Declaration*, drafted by John Ruggie (UN Secretariat), was an effective synopsis of these (Luca, Hayley, Paul).

#### **4.1.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

This finding supports hypothesis one (rational synoptic) in so far as the policy texts and policy actors present the MDGs as a response to global challenges and opportunities. Although there is no evidence that a comprehensive rational synoptic study of global challenges and opportunities was done as part of the MDG selection process. This finding does not support hypothesis two (critical theory) because there is repeated reference to addressing poverty in policy texts and by policy actors. This finding supports hypothesis three (world society theory), in that policy texts and policy actors had a shared view, that poverty was a critical problem in the lead up to the selection of the MDGs and that the MDGs were selected in light of this poverty. They shared the assumption that universal primary education was central to a multi-dimensional approach to development, following a well-established (Western) model.

## 4.2 Strengthening the UN

“I knew we needed leadership of a different kind to renew the UN’s mission for development- and to do it in an innovative, energetic way” (Annan 2012, p. 216).

According the UN MDG website (UN 2014b) the MDGs “have galvanized unprecedented efforts to meet the needs of the world’s poorest”. Yet this research has also found that a motivation for selecting the MDGs was to strengthen and focus UN efforts. A stronger UN was required to deliver a global policy agenda (UNGA 2001 and UNGA 2001a), and the MDG process also provided career opportunities for development professionals.

At the 52<sup>nd</sup> session of the UN General Assembly in 1997 it was under an agenda item entitled ‘Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform’ (UN) that the Secretary General proposed a Millennium Assembly. In 1998, there was a related agenda item entitled ‘United Nations reform: measures and proposals’, which made clear the desire for an animating vision and better focus. In that same session, the Secretary General was requested to consult member states, members of specialised agencies, NGOs and observers to propose “a number of forward-looking and widely relevant topics that could help to focus the Millennium Summit within the context of an overall theme” (UN 1998, p. 598). Therefore the Millennium Summit and focus topics had their origins in providing a focus for and renewing the UN.

Policy texts also show that policy actors saw the MDGs as an opportunity to strengthen the position of the UN. In March of 2000, prior to the Millennium Summit, the Secretary General published *We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Despite Kofi Anna later presenting this as a blueprint for the MDGs (as in Annan 2012) in fact the text’s focus was largely on what sort of UN was required to meet the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The *Millennium Declaration* (2000) provides a further example. In this text strengthening the UN and related themes were prominent, making up 21% of all coded themes. In the *Road Map* (2001) the same themes made up 29% of coded themes. This shows that policy actors who influenced those texts were seeing this initiative as an opportunity to strengthen and focus the UN. Therefore,

in part, the MDG initiative had an institutional dimension, to strengthen the UN. In subsequent texts this theme was excluded.

The selection of MDGs and MDG2 also served the needs of development professionals, because it ensured their employment as “All kinds of people were called in to do all kinds of work” (Hayley). This reinforces Buchanan’s (1998) point that bureaucracy is self-perpetuating and gradually expands over time. This is also reflective of Hill’s (1997) emphasis on the sometimes self-interested intentions of development professionals.

So there is evidence that a motivation for selecting the MDGs and MDG2, was strengthening the role of the United Nations. Within this a particular sub-group, development professionals in the UN and related multilateral organisations, had the opportunity to strengthen and perpetuate itself. Yet alongside this, with a string of ambitious texts in the 1990’s (see Appendix 4) and an ambitious *Millennium Declaration*, a strong and focussed UN was needed to deliver what was hoped for.

#### **4.2.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

This finding supports hypothesis one (rational synoptic) in so far as strengthening the UN would provide the opportunity for more effective rational action by specialists. The finding supports hypothesis two (critical theory) in so far as the stated reason for adopting the MDGs was to alleviate poverty and suffering, but an underlying reason was strengthening the UN and thereby also perpetuating the interests of development professionals. In relation to hypothesis three (world society theory) this finding supports it in so far as it was quite taken for granted that the UN should set ambitious goals and that there should be an effective and focussed UN to support those goals. This finding also falls partly outside any one of the three hypotheses, pointing to multiple motivations for MDG2’s selection.

### **4.3 Accepted with remarkable consensus**

“There was always going to be an education goal. If you could have asked anybody at the time, most people would have said that the most important was primary schooling”

(Tim).

This section shows that, among elite policy actors, universal primary education was a largely taken for granted policy priority and accepted with a remarkable consensus. UN General Assembly commitment to universal primary education had been on the development agenda for over 50 years leading up to the Millennium Summit. In 1948 *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* stated “Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory” (Article 26). In 1960 UNESCO’s *Convention against Discrimination in Education* declared that all nation-states have the responsibility to “To make primary education free and compulsory” (UNESCO 2014, article 4a). According to Giancarlo “Reaching universal primary education in all of the developing world was on everyone’s lips at the time”. In the 1970’s the second Decade of Development identified universal primary education, with texts stating “Particular attention should be paid to achieving enrolment of all children of primary school age” (UN 1970, 18(b)).

This does not mean that universal primary education was the only education priority throughout that time. There were variations and shifting emphases. As Max stated “Before the late 1980s primary education was not the flavour of the month – certainly in the Bank and to some degree in UNESCO”. However universal primary education had been prominent on the UN policy agenda over time.

In 1990, at Jomtien, policy shifted toward basic education for all ages, not just primary school age (UNESCO 2007, UNESCO 2015). Max explained that the difference between primary and basic education is not widely understood, but basic education includes all ages. For Tim “even though Jomtien had other vocabulary, the fundamental message was that universal primary education was a priority”. The World Bank at the time held that the rate of return on primary education was superior to that of secondary or tertiary education (Psacharopoulos 2006).

Achieving universal primary education was included in both *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (1996) and *A Better World for All* (2000). At the World Education Forum, Dakar (2000), universal primary education was one of six goals agreed to. Although its scope was broader than what eventually became MDG2. It included not just enrolment but also completion, that it be free, compulsory and of good quality (UNESCO 2015a).

The outcome of the Millennium Summit (2000) also included universal primary education. Universal primary education was included in an annex to the *Road Map* (2001) with the proposed goal to ensure that, “by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling” (UN Secretary General 2001, p. 56). Although this represents a narrowing and reduction of the goal. Dakar had identified that primary education should be free, compulsory and of good quality, yet MDG2 narrows the criteria down to being able to complete a full course of primary schooling.

For Tim, MDG2’s selection “was fairly uncontroversial”. According to Tim, the research base in relation to the benefits of primary education was extremely strong and “Whatever way you look at it, it has a fantastically high benefit”. Likewise Max and Hayley said there was always going to be an education goal and that universal primary education was an obvious choice. Paul said

“We are inculturated to the view that universal primary education was a minimum.... To be honest it was automatic, it was a no brainer. I think we spent maximum 5 minutes discussing it. It was totally uncontroversial... It was so automatic, uncontroversial and essential to any multi-dimensional conception of development that it went in without discussion. There was zero dissent”.

Paul’s statement shows a remarkable shared view by elite policy actors of the universal applicability of Western style primary schooling. It was accepted as a globally applicable model irrespective of context, as per the world society theory hypothesis. The “maximum 5 minutes discussing it” (Paul) shows that elite policy actors did not consider the pros and cons of universal primary education in a comprehensive and structured manner. Nor did policy texts or elite policy actors provide a comprehensive explanation as to how universal primary education would address poverty.

There was also a strong moral and emotional commitment influencing the remarkable consensus around MDG2. Paul pointed out that people selecting the MDGs “see themselves as strongly progressive activists who have devoted their lives to this”. For policy actors universal primary education was “a deep moral commitment” and their work to realise it was “moral entrepreneurship” (Paul). Hayley also spoke about the



moral commitment and tenacity of policy actors, who were determined to get the goals through. Hayley said that the goals “reached the heart and imagination of people”. Critical discourse analysis also showed that policy texts frequently use language that reflects a strong moral and emotional commitment. *Investing in Development* (2005) is a good example of this, with a high level of moral commitment included in the introduction and reports of some of the working groups. Elster (1994) writes about the effect of emotion on rational actions and vice versa. For Elster emotion and rationality are not opposed to one another because rationality is not objective, and because emotion provides motivation for rational actions.

MDG2 conformed to the social norms of how to approach development among elite policy actors (vis-à-vis Elster’s work on social norms, 1994). There may have been consequences for policy actors who questioned or went outside that policy norm, such as exclusion or diminished respect by peers, employers, or others. Whilst there was no evidence found in this study of compulsion to support MDG2, with statements from the Secretary General about the MDGs being morally undeniable (Annan 2012) and with the World Bank, IMF and OECD DAC so openly supporting universal primary education, a policy actor would want good reason to disagree. It is difficult to argue against the right of a child to a primary education.

However that same group of elite policy actors were not as clear on who, beyond their own peers, supported MDG2. When Hayley was asked “Who supported MDG2?” Hayley hesitated then said “UNICEF, UNESCO. I think everybody. I cannot imagine anybody saying not yet”. Beyond that inner circle, however, policy actors were not as supportive. For example UNESCO, at Dakar, had just openly opposed the selection of universal primary education as the only global fast track initiative (Max).

In the policy process more broadly other educational priorities, such as secondary, tertiary and technical education were included, but not selected as MDGs. *Investing in Development* gives equal attention to primary, secondary and tertiary education. The *World Summit Outcome* (2005) gives equal attention to primary, secondary and tertiary education and also includes vocational and technical education, EFA, Dakar and the importance of UNESCO. Even elite policy actors Luca and Paul were not dismissive of including other levels of education, but simply because they were not included in the

*Millennium Declaration* they said they could not include them in MDG2. MDG2, as presented in the *Annex* (2001), remained the accepted policy text and did not change between 2000 and 2015. Table 4.2 shows these various educational priorities and that universal primary education was consistent throughout.

Table 4.2: Overview of educational priorities expressed in policy texts

World Declaration on Education for All	Shaping the 21st Century	The Dakar Framework for Action.	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration	Road Map	Road Map Annex	Investing in Development	Final form of MDGs
1990	1996	2000	2000	2000	2001	2001	2005	Post 2007
Universal Primary Education <sup>5</sup>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Early childhood care and education, especially for the most vulnerable and disadvantaged		✓						
Young people and adults: appropriate learning and life-skills programmes		✓						
Achieving a 50 per cent improvement in levels of adult literacy by 2015		✓						

<sup>5</sup> Some texts emphasise completion (EFA, *Investing in Development*). Others emphasize enrolment (MDGs).

World Declaration on Education for All	Shaping the 21st Century	The Dakar Framework for Action.	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration	Road Map	Road Map Annex	Investing in Development	Final form of MDGs
Equitable access to basic and continuing education for all		✓						
Improving all aspects of the quality of education		✓						
							Education to address and alleviate poverty	
							Improved provision of secondary education	
							Improved provision of tertiary/higher education	
							Formal and informal education	
							Abolition of school fees	

Pierson's work (2000) is relevant to this finding. The remarkable acceptance of universal primary education as a development priority had a historical dimension stretching even as far back as 1948. This shows the tendency for an institution, an organisation or a policy process to stay on its current pathway. There was a widely shared assumption by policy actors interviewed that universal primary education would deliver returns over time. The remarkable consensus around MDG2 also had an institutional dimension showing how, once commitment to universal primary education was established, it became "embedded in institutions -whether formal rules, policy structures, or norms" (Pierson 2000, p. 264). This also helps explain why policy actors in the inner circle took for granted that there was wide support for MDG2, but had little evidence to show that it was taken for granted beyond their inner circle. However, to qualify, this study is not proposing that understanding of and commitment to universal primary education was shared uniformly by policy actors or institutions throughout that

entire period. Policy processes, organisations and individuals are more complex than that. Although it is clear that universal primary education was a priority over an extended period.

#### **4.3.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

This finding support hypothesis one (rational synoptic), but with a qualification. MDG2 was an obvious and 'common sense' choice following its presence in various UN policies stemming as far back as 1948. There was evidence that policy actors considered 1990's agreements as providing a synoptic analysis of global challenges and opportunities. However, there is no evidence that specialists provided reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas in selecting MDG2. This finding supports hypothesis two (critical theory) in so far as MDG2 was a policy that supported only primary education, whereas EFA had a broader set of priorities. In that sense MDG2 was narrower than EFA. There is no evidence, however, that policy actors selected MDG2 to divert resources away from secondary and higher education. Nor is there evidence to show that MDG2 was selected to relegate developing countries to the intellectual periphery and make them less able to compete on world markets. This finding strongly supports hypothesis three (world society theory) because universal primary education was accepted with a remarkable consensus, despite the obvious economic, political and cultural differences between nation-states. The remarkable consensus regarding both education and universal primary education as policy priorities is partly explained by the UN's relatively consistent 50-year commitment to universal primary education preceding the MDGs and by historical and institutional path dependence.

#### **4.4 A complex and opaque policy process**

"The UN's development agenda itself was... scattered across a dizzying thirty-two funds, agencies, programs, departments and offices. As things stood there was little hope of any cohesion or single strategic purpose among these organizations" (Annan 2012, p. 220).

The MDGs were presented as agreed to by world leaders at the UN Millennium Summit in 2000, arising out of a linear, rational and stable policy process. Therefore they are claimed to be the world's targets (UN Secretary General 2001, UNMP 2005,

UNMP 2014). Yet this was not the case. MDG2 ended up in the final list of eight goals because it survived a complex and opaque policy process. The majority of goals and targets identified in the *Millennium Declaration* did not end up in that final list. Also education, proportionately, increased in prominence, comprising effectively two of eight goals (MDG2 and MDG3). Elite policy actors said that they created a parallel policy process that determined the MDGs because they were concerned that normal UN policy processes would yield little, if any, results (Luca, Hayley). This parallel process cut a pathway through the complexity.

To illustrate the complexity of the process which MDG2 survived: In 1996 OECD DAC's *Shaping the 21st Century* contained a list of six goals almost identical to what were later called the MDGs including universal primary education. In 2000, prior to the Millennium Summit, the IMF, World Bank, OECD DAC and the UN Secretary General published *A Better World for All*, containing seven goals, known as the International Development Goals (IDGs)<sup>6</sup>. These were also almost identical to the 1996 OECD DAC goals and what were later called the MDGs. Following only a few months after *A Better World for All*, the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) contained arguably 75 priorities and no list of MDGs. In 2001 the *Road Map*, claimed to contain all of the priorities identified in the *Millennium Declaration*, yet contained only 61 priorities, down from 75. Then in the *Road Map Annex* a reduced list of eight goals and associated targets was proposed, making a total of 20 distinct priorities<sup>7</sup>. In the final form of the MDGs, post 2007, there were eight goals, with associated targets, making 22 distinct priorities. So the process was not a straight-forward identification of eight goals and associated targets by the UN General Assembly.

Comprehensive tracking of all priorities in all MDG policy texts is provided in Appendix 2. Table 4.3 below shows the number of priorities identified per policy text<sup>8</sup> demonstrating the complexity of the process that MDG2 survived.

---

<sup>6</sup> Maternal health and infant mortality was one goal in 1996, split into 2 goals in 2000.

<sup>7</sup> 8 goals and 18 targets. Some targets repeat goal. N discreet priorities = 20.

<sup>8</sup> The terms 'goals' and 'objectives' were used, hence use of the term 'priorities' to cover both.

Table 4.3: Number of identified goals/targets (priorities <sup>9</sup>) per policy text

Text	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World for All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Final form of MDGs
Year	1996	2000	2000	2001	2001	2005	2007
Number of identified targets/ goals (priorities)	6	7	75 <sup>10</sup>	61	20	20 <sup>11</sup>	22 <sup>12</sup>

Table 4.4 below also demonstrates the complexity of the policy process. It tracks the appearance of priorities that ended up in the final form of the MDGs. The table shows that not all of the priorities were included in the *Millennium Declaration*. It shows that some priorities were included at certain points, later excluded, and then later again re-included. It also shows that one priority appeared for the first time in 2007. Thus proving that the list of 8 MDGs was not voted on by the General Assembly at the Millennium Summit.

<sup>9</sup> Tracking of priorities was difficult as priorities appeared and disappeared from text to text.

<sup>10</sup> Some priorities begin with "To" and some begin with "We". Calculation of priorities may include repetition, but if had slight change was regarded as discrete. Even if number less than 75, still more than Road Map.

<sup>11</sup> Identical to *Road Map Annex* (2001)

<sup>12</sup> MDG targets changed between 2005 and 2014. Table 4.4 shows this.

Table 4.4 Tracking of priorities included in final form of MDGs<sup>13</sup>

	Shaping 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration	Road Map	Road Map Annex	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
	1996	2000	2000	2000	2000	2005	2007
	No vote	No vote	Vote	No vote	No vote	No vote	No vote
Special needs of least developed countries			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Develop further an open, rule-based, ( <b>equitable</b> <sup>14</sup> ) predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Address needs of landlocked developing countries and small island states			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty & hunger by half	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Halve the number of people whose income is less than \$1 (later \$1.25) per day			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sustainable access to safe drinking water and sanitation			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Universal primary education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reducing mortality rates for infants and children by two-thirds	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reducing maternal mortality by three-quarters	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

<sup>13</sup> More detailed version in Appendix 2: Includes changes in wording, splitting of goals.

<sup>14</sup> The word **equitable** was eliminated in all texts after the Millennium Declaration. Giancarlo said the "World Bank has never agreed to equity".

	Shaping 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration	Road Map	Road Map Annex	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
Universal access to reproductive health	✓	✓					✓
Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS							✓
Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Employment and decent work for all, including women and young people			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Affordable access to essential drugs in cooperation with pharmaceutical companies			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
New technologies, ICT- in cooperation with the private sector			✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Integrate principles of environmental sustainability	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Reduce biodiversity loss			✓	✓			✓

A striking feature of table 4.4 is that universal primary education was one of only four priorities included at all stages of the process and barely changed between 1996 and 2015. The other three were: eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education, improving maternal health and reducing infant mortality. So throughout a 20-year policy process, there were numerous educational priorities, but only MDG2 and MDG3 stayed the same and remained in key policy texts between 1996 and 2015. This reinforces the view of Luca, Giancarlo, Hayley, Leopoldo and Paul, that there were always going to be health and education goals and that universal primary education was for them an obvious inclusion.



#### **4.4.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

This finding does not support hypothesis one (rational synoptic), as there is no evidence of a rational synoptic situation analysis. Rather there were substantial inclusions and exclusions of policy priorities that are not explained in a rational synoptic framework. This finding supports hypothesis two (critical) in so far as the policy process was certainly complex and opaque. Yet there is no evidence of policy actors purposefully diverting resources away from secondary and higher education. Secondary and higher education are included in various policy texts as well as assumed within the targets of MDG3. This finding strongly supports hypothesis three (world society) because it shows that universal primary education was a widely accepted policy priority and education model. In the words of Paul it was “a no brainer”. It survived a highly complex policy process, where most priorities identified in the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) were excluded. This finding also falls partly outside any one of the three hypotheses and theories used in this study. It points to a priority permeating a multilayered, multidimensional and organic policy process. This will be discussed further in the following chapter.

#### **4.5 Elite policy actors and the *Road Map Annex***

“We sneaked it in. Another group were writing the Road Map, this is normal. Usually such a report follows a resolution. But the *Road Map Annex*- nobody paid attention, it's an annex. That's how we got it in” (Luca).

Events of the policy process between 2000 and 2001 were crucial in MDG2's selection. The MDGs, as we know them today, were articulated in an annex at the back of the *Road Map* (2001). MDG2 was included. So for understanding how and why MDG2 came to be selected, we must understand how and why universal primary education came to be included in the *Road Map Annex*. This section explores that important phase of the policy process. A range of data were used to ensure reliability of this account, as outlined in Chapter 3.

Policy actors involved in writing that annex said that they “Sneaked it in” (Luca) and that “We were pretty cheeky, we attached (it) to a report” (Hayley). The 50+ policy actors from key agencies deciding the list of goals in the *Annex* used a rational

decision-making process (Luca), but not in the fullest sense of rational synoptic theory as discussed in this study. The inclusion of MDG2 in the *Annex*, and the exclusion of other priorities, was neither open nor transparent, but rather an opaque aspect of the policy process. Policy actors said they did this because they were concerned that the *Millennium Declaration* was too broad to achieve, that it would slip away into history without achieving its objectives. According to Luca most UN agreements or declarations have a shelf life of about 4-6 months. So six months after the Millennium Summit, Michael Doyle (Successor to John Ruggie) and Jan Vandemoortele “sat together and said ‘how can we avoid that the *Millennium Declaration* would follow the same path’” (Luca). As they were “sitting in New York over a cappuccino they came up with an idea to put together a stand alone list- taking key elements of the *Millennium Declaration*” (Luca).

Interviewee Hayley gives a different account, saying that the MDGs “basically came out of John Ruggie’s brain”. Although Hayley said that he synthesised agreements of the 1990’s in the draft UNMD. The Harvard Kennedy School of Government website gives the (misleading) impression, that John Ruggie was responsible for proposing and gaining General Assembly approval for the Millennium Development Goals (Kennedy School of Government 2014). Given that Michael Doyle succeeded John Ruggie before the *Road Map* and *Road Map Annex* were created, clearly John Ruggie did not determine the MDGs.

Close analysis of the different accounts revealed that Hayley consistently referred to the “7 MDGs (from)... June 2000”. So she was talking about the IDGs included in *A Better World for All* (2000). Therefore Hayley regarded the IDGs as the MDG policy. Hayley said that it was Louise Fréchette, John Ruggie and “a couple of others” that developed the goals and that “The bureaucracy had no reason to get nervous because everything had been agreed to”. Hayley was a high-level policy actor in the UN Secretariat. As far as she was concerned the goals were already determined before the Millennium Summit occurred and certainly before they appeared in the *Road Map* and *Road Map Annex*. Her account reveals the extent to which policy actors from the UN Secretariat controlled the global policy agenda. This study found no evidence that the 8 MDGs were ever voted on by the General Assembly as a stand-alone list.

The level of Kofi Annan's awareness of the *Road Map Annex* is unclear. Luca said that, in regards to the *Annex*, "Kofi Annan did not know about it". It seems unusual that the Secretary General would not know what the 50+ high profile people at the table were discussing. Those at the table included some of his close advisors, as well as the World Bank, IMF and OECD. However Luca said that those at the table kept it from Kofi Annan because of the widespread criticism of his cooperation with the World Bank, IMF and OECD in *A Better World for All* just one year earlier. Annan makes no mention of this in his recollections (2012). When Paul was asked about this he said "Well you could ask Kofi Annan that yourself", followed by, "he knew about the *Annex*". In feedback from Paul on a draft version of this research inquiry, he said "I recall speaking to Kofi Annan at least twice in the Spring of 2001, and he did approve them before they were issued in a joint statement by the World Bank and IMF, but no he did not follow the process closely (no SG except on a very small number of issues can)".

Annan's account (2012) gives the impression that he knew about the *Annex* and that the MDGs were central to his concerns as Secretary General. He states "From the *Millennium Declaration* we would develop the eight Millennium Development Goals. These were finalized in the summer of 2001 after a process of consultation and negotiation led by John Ruggie and Michael Doyle and overseen by my able deputy, Louise Frechette" (p. 226). Annan's account is at odds with other elite policy actors, and may be an example of Hill's (1997) assertion that policy elites can easily attach rational intentions to policy decisions retrospectively, leaving the deep irrationality of the process unacknowledged.

Data from this study indicates the most likely scenario for how the MDGs and MDG2 came to be a part of the *Road Map Annex*: Following their meeting in New York, Michael Doyle and Jan Vandemoortele "got 50+ key people together around the table, including OECD, IMF, World Bank, UNICEF, WHO, and regional organisations. They were all there" (Luca). The *Road Map* text verifies this list. Jan Vandemoortele looked after the agencies and had a key role in determining the targets for monitoring (Giancarlo). Michael Doyle looked after the governments. This group put together a stand-alone list of eight goals and associated targets and indicators. The selection process took about six months (Luca). According to Luca, policy actors took the targets verbatim out of the *Millennium Declaration* text as they "were not allowed to

reinvent the wheel”. Paul said that *Millennium Declaration* was “our bible” and that “We had the IDGs in front of us on the table also. We borrowed and revised the IDGs where appropriate... We weren’t prepared to trash the good ideas in the IDGs. We wanted to translate them into something that had system wide support”. This explains why most of what was in the IDGs was later included in the MDGs. It might also explain why elite policy actor Hayley mistakenly associated John Ruggie with designing the MDGs and referred to the “7 MDGs”, because she conflated the IDGs with the MDGs.

The process of getting agreement on the goals and targets in the *Annex* was tough. According to Luca the gatekeepers, “did not have many friends in that process”. Luca stated that priorities could not be both concise and comprehensive “You can’t have the two”; rather they had to be “clear, concise, measurable”. Luca, Max, Giancarlo, Hayley and Leopoldo reinforced this fundamental point. The point was also emphasised in the *Road Map* (2001) and by the UN Millennium Project (UN Millennium Project 2014). Luca said that whilst everybody agreed there should be a limited number of goals, everybody also wanted their own goals in. Many were left aside and consequently some at the table became upset. So whilst policy actors referred to the *Millennium Declaration* as their “bible”, they ignored the majority of its contents. Ironically, making it an apt simile.

Interesting also is that two key policy actors (Luca and Hayley) said those writing the *Annex* made a particular point of trying to avoid the notice of powerful nation states and policy actors. As it turned out, some at the General Assembly were aware of it.

On 19 November 2001<sup>15</sup> the *Road Map* and *Annex* were debated for over 7 hours at the General Assembly. Verbatim meeting records show that the *Millennium Declaration* and *Road Map* were uppermost in members’ minds, not the *Road Map Annex*. As an example, the Mexican representative stated “Both the Declaration and the road map should not remain documents but should be implemented in their entirety” (United Nations General Assembly<sup>16</sup> 2001a, p. 17). Japan stated “The Japanese Government for its part will continue to participate in, and contribute to, such

---

<sup>15</sup> 58<sup>th</sup> and 59<sup>th</sup> Plenary Meeting. 56<sup>th</sup> Session of the General Assembly

<sup>16</sup> UNGA

efforts of the United Nations, with a firm commitment to realize the goals of the *Millennium Declaration*” (UNGA 2001a, p. 13). Of the 30 countries that spoke, all reaffirmed commitment to the goals of the *Millennium Declaration*, all highlighted priorities and goals from the *Millennium Declaration* that were not included in the *Annex* (See Appendix 6). None of the 30 countries that spoke expressed the view that the *Road Map Annex* was the policy.

11 countries made reference to the *Annex* in the debate. Singapore stated “Perhaps one of the most useful sections of the document is found in pages 56 to 58, which spells out 8 goals, 18 targets and more than 40 concrete indicators” (UNGA 2001, p. 21). Mongolia supported the formulation of goals targets and indicators, and saw the formulation as a good basis. Belgium referred to the *Annex* as a first step in having a refined list of goals. Malaysia mentioned the 8 goals and 18 targets and used them as reminder of the need for Official Development Assistance. The Republic of Korea mentioned the *Annex* as an enhancement of the *Road Map* (but not a replacement).

Countries that raised concerns about the *Annex* included Peru, who called for greater clarity regarding Goal 8 and who said that a range of priorities from the *Millennium Declaration*, not included in the *Annex*, should also be acted upon. Guatemala said that the General Assembly might have erred in calling for a road map, because “the *Millennium Declaration* itself constitutes the road map and what is now sought is, precisely, the manner in which it should be implemented”.

Development professionals who created the *Annex* were concerned that the United States of America (“G1”) might not support it. Luca said that “Luckily G1 were asleep at the desk when the *Road Map* was dealt with and they did not read the *Annex*”. The verbatim records contradict Luca’s account. The USA raised questions about the *Annex*’s validity and legal status. The USA representative, Mr Siv, had only been sworn in 9 days earlier (UNGA 2001a). Between then and the session to discuss the *Road Map* there had been an open debate regarding 9/11 events. In the words of a number of representatives, the debate regarding 9/11 and terrorism was exhausting (UNGA 2001a). However Mr Siv still highlighted the importance of a range of goals from the *Millennium Declaration* including combatting terrorism and the heavily indebted poor countries initiative. In the closing statement he said that the *Road Map*

has useful ideas, but that consensus has not been reached on it. He also stated that each country is responsible for devising its own strategies. Finally he looked “forward to Member States’ consideration of the language in the newly formulated millennium development goals and the suggested indicators” (UNGA 2001a, p.8). So the position of the USA, at that point, was that the *Road Map* had not been agreed to, the *Annex* had not been agreed to and that countries were responsible for their own strategies.

In the morning session, the Czech Republic stated that the GA Hall was almost empty despite the fact that “we were about to discuss one of the crucial strategic issues on our list” (UNGA 2001a, p.10). Algeria stated “my delegation is surprised that neither the Secretary General nor any representative of his are present to submit these very important documents or to hear our comments”. Later versions of events state that the MDGs were unveiled by the Secretary General in 2001 (UN Millennium Project 2014), which was clearly not the case, as he was not even at the session. This makes it more likely that Kofi Annan was not particularly aware of the refined list of the *Road Map Annex*. It also raises the possibility that the MDGs were not as central to Kofi Annan’s policy agenda as he later claimed (Annan 2012). If they were he would have been at the session, or at least he would have sent a representative. Also, it reinforces interview statements by Hayley and Luca that they indeed tried to sneak the *Annex* through.

Education was barely discussed in the session. In the seven hours of General Assembly debate there were only two references to education. The first was by the USA, who emphasised the importance of higher education. The second was by Nauru, who emphasised the importance of basic education (for all ages). Not one of the 30 countries discussed universal primary education. This is difficult to interpret as it could mean that universal primary education was a widely accepted priority and was therefore not discussed. Or that it was not on the radar and was only widely accepted and taken for granted by the elite policy actors who determined the *Road Map Annex*.

Then there was the reaction following the session on the *Road Map*. Luca said Jan (Vandemoortele) and Michael (Doyle) were called in, not by Kofi Annan, but by (*a high ranking member of the Secretariat- name deleted*). (*name deleted*) was “going off” on them. (*name deleted*) said ‘Why did you not inform us?’” and was upset because they

had brought the office of development too close to the Secretary General as development was “a bit below the Secretary General”. According to Luca the high-ranking member of the Secretariat was also upset because they allowed OECD DAC at the table. Luca said, on later reflection, involving OECD DAC was a mistake. That “they learned that we were conniving with OECD. The perception was that the Secretariat was supposed to be impartial”. Another interviewee confirmed that this meeting occurred, but gave no information as to what happened at it. For the purposes of anonymity the interviewees name is not mentioned here.

In the months following, the *Annex* gained in popularity. Luca said, despite initial criticism by the UN Secretariat, once they realised they had something of value, the MDGs “started to creep into the speeches of the Secretary General”. For Hayley “all actors, like the UNDP, World Bank, IMF and also NGOs kind of realised that they had a good tool to give a framework for the next 15 years. One that would appeal to people”. Hayley said “It gelled after that”.

So there are different accounts as to exactly who created the 8 MDGs and as to Kofi Annan’s level of awareness. Yet still they point to one finding- that the MDGs were selected by a handful of elite policy actors. They were based on the IDGs, and certainly not the democratic process of the UN General Assembly at the Millennium Summit, as indicated in a range of misleading UN statements (United Nations 2104, UN Millennium Project 2005). All evidence, from texts, to interviews, to relationship maps and to the chronological record of events, point to elite policy actors’ crucial role in determining the *Road Map Annex*. It was the contents of the *Annex* that became the policy.

#### **4.5.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

In regards to hypothesis one (rational synoptic) this finding does not support it. MDG2 was not selected by the UN General Assembly, but by elite policy actors who skilfully managed a politically complex and shifting policy process. Whilst the 50+ policy actors at the table who selected the MDGs used rational capacities, there was not a formal, rational, synoptic analysis of global challenges and opportunities as part of the process to determine the *Annex*. This finding supports hypothesis two (critical), in so far as it demonstrates the highly complex and opaque nature of the policy process. It shows

secret agreements, conniving and sneaking in priorities, even with the intention of seeking the best policy outcomes. The process was misrepresented to the broader public. This study found no evidence that MDG2 was voted on by the General Assembly as part of a list of 8 MDGs. It also supports hypothesis three, because of the uncontroversial nature of universal primary education as a policy priority and widely taken for granted acceptance on the part of elite policy actors. Whether it was supported by the General Assembly is not clear, because it was not discussed in the debate on the *Road Map*.

#### **4.6 World opinion? The absence of developing country and educator voices**

“The global debate is conducted by and amongst people that are of the same culture. They had tertiary education in prestigious Western universities and understand development in similar ways. You would be less likely to have agreement on goals if you took, for example, someone from a Latin American indigenous community, someone from rural China and Sub-Saharan Africa. If you take a disparate group you are less likely to get a cohesive agreement” (Tim).

Building on the previous finding, this finding shows that developing countries and educators had little or no say in the selection of MDG2. Whilst nation-states at the General Assembly were making policy decisions and agreeing on policy texts, on the other hand elite policy actors were running a parallel process, generating alternate policy texts. These determined the 8 MDGs and MDG2. Therefore it is unreasonable to claim that the MDGs represent world opinion.

Among the policy elite the Secretary General, Kofi Annan, played a key role. In the preface of *Investing in Development* (2005) he is credited as the person “who launched the UN Millennium Project and who has played an unparalleled role in promoting the fight against extreme poverty”. It was Kofi Annan who first proposed to the General Assembly that there be a Millennium Summit and to set poverty reduction goals for the new Millennium. According to Kofi Annan, uncertainty of the General Assembly on just what the Millennium Summit would achieve “gave useful leeway in how to fashion the event and accompanying debate. The traditional role of the



secretary-general for such occasions is to arrange the administrative and organizational procedures. But I sensed an opportunity to deploy our moral power as well... I came to the view early that poverty should form the core" (p. 222). He and the UN Secretariat assumed the role of process manager<sup>17</sup>. This gave the Secretary General and his staff a high level of control over the process. In recalling how they established the priorities even before the Millennium Summit, Kofi Annan writes that he "issued a report, *We the Peoples: The Role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, to be considered by all member states before the Millennium Summit" (2012, p. 222). The normal process of drafting such documents takes months of negotiations and compromise meaning that, according to Annan, "the outcome was almost always the lowest common denominator. Poverty was never going to move forward on that basis. So instead I asked two senior aides... John Ruggie and Andrew Mack, to take the lead in producing the report without the departments taking any formal role and without consultation of member states. Between them and a tight circle from my office, we then produced the document" (p. 223). According to Annan "Because of how we fashioned and produced *We the Peoples*, if member states wanted an agreement, they were going to have to work with the deal on poverty that we had set up for them. There was no other deal" (pp. 224-225). This supports Chabbott's point that development professionals set agendas, establish priorities, and mandate action "somewhat independently of both nation-states that funded them and their stated beneficiaries" (2003, p. 2).

There was a difference between the reasons emphasised for the selection of MDGs by elite policy actors in interviews for this case study and what was found in policy texts and accounts such as Annan's (2012). Written accounts and texts state that the MDGs were selected to combat the grinding poverty affecting hundreds of millions (UN Secretary General 2001, UN Millennium Project 2005). But in interviews, two of the four interviewees that were in the inner circle made little mention of poverty or combatting poverty as a reason for selecting MDG2. Instead they talked mostly about the MDGs arising out of UN policy processes, agreements and policy texts (44% on average) and about the strategies, work and influence of development professionals (31% on average). There was very little discussion of education in the interviews of those same two interviewees (only 2% of coded themes were educational) and this

---

<sup>32</sup> Similar example from EU Commission: Souto-Otero et al 2008.

was following my prompting them to talk about education. There was also no discussion of the advantages of formal primary schooling in comparison with secondary, tertiary or vocational and technical education.

This study also found no evidence that developing countries had much direct say in the policy process leading to the selection of the MDGs. There is no evidence that nation-state representatives of developing countries were involved in determining the priorities identified in the *Road Map Annex*. Developing countries were represented at the General Assembly, but the General Assembly did not decide the list of 8 MDGs nor MDG2. Verbatim records of General Assembly session concerning the *Road Map* show that nation-state representatives had little awareness of the *Annex* and did not regard it as the agreed policy text. Further to this, the G77 had stood up against setting global goals when it was proposed in 1995 at Copenhagen, stating that developing countries should have a say in setting their own goals appropriate to their situation. Paul gave the only evidence of direct involvement of developing countries in determining policy priorities. He said “MDG8 was done at the insistence of G77. I cleared all the language with them at a breakfast meeting of the leadership of G77. I presented a rough draft of Goal 8, it was essential to gaining their support”. So based on this there was involvement of developing countries, but only via a limited number of leaders of G-77.

The virtual absence of developing country voice in the policy process and prominence of development professionals and trans-national organisations is a key issue for the MDGs. It is reflective of Luke’s (2005) point that in policy processes people or groups create and reinforce barriers to public discussion of policy conflicts. In this way “that person or group has power” (p. 8). In relation to the MDGs, whether consciously or unconsciously, nation state voices were not included in the inner circle of decision makers. Luca and Hayley made no mention of member states having any say in the selection of MDGs or MDG2. There are recent indications that current UN Secretary General, Ban Ki Moon, recognises this as a flaw in the MDG policy process. In a recent report regarding the SDG process (2014) there is a section titled “What we have learned from two decades of development experience” (p. 6). In that section the Secretary General states “The discussion on the post-2015 sustainable development

agenda has stressed the importance of the specific conditions in each country, an advance in perspective from the Millennium Development Goals framework” (p.8).

For policy actor Claudia there are serious consequences of the fact that developing countries had little or no say in the MDGs. As Claudia stated “West is best still hangs in there”. For Claudia those working in the inner circle of policy actors are well-intentioned people, but they just “get further and further into how great they are”. Critical discourse analysis and coding of policy texts supported what Claudia said, in so far as the themes of private sector involvement and neo-liberal priorities, reflective of the Western hegemony, substantially increased in prominence during the policy process.

This study also found no evidence that developing countries were opposed to the MDGs. As will be discussed in the concluding chapter, the views of developing countries regarding the MDGs were not sought for this study. Nevertheless it is clear that they had little, if any, say in selecting the MDGs.

The voice of educators were also largely excluded from the decision making process. Neither UNESCO nor any representative of educators were at the table with elite policy actors who selected MDG2. There is no evidence of elite policy actors seeking the views of educators as part of the policy process. When we consider that both MDG2 and the MDG3 are regarding education this seems unusual. For Claudia it was clear that “educators have been left out of the conversation”. Claudia said “My disappointment in educators is that they saw what was happening and did not do anything”.

Whilst educators were not included in the process, the education community is also responsible for providing clear policy priorities and may have failed to do so. According to Max “Education never has been good at articulating its development case, partly because there are a number of different arguments about it and academics are not of one mind”. And partly because “economists think we (educators) are basically a bunch of \_ \_ \_ \_ \_”. Although according to Max, we should be cautious in our criticism of the MDG selection process. For Max a certain ritual exists around these policy processes. It includes consultation, massive data collection and a filtering down of

priorities. It is “a certain sort of international process which people in the UN and development agencies are so familiar with, it's the way they work. At the end of the day it is a relatively small group of wise men, sometimes women too, who make the selection”. For Max, as long as we are locked into the belief that “we need a global process and goals, then what are our alternatives? The paradigm dictates its own method”. Also, Paul stated that policy actors “see themselves as strongly progressive activists who have devoted their lives to this”.

Therefore it was an elite group of policy actors that determined the selection of MDG2, not the democratic processes of the General Assembly, nor any broader consultation process. Neither developing nations nor educators had much (if any) say in the selection of MDG2. They adopted a particular model of education, namely, universal primary education. Nevertheless policy actors Luca, Max, Giancarlo, Tim and Hayley were of the view that the action of those who selected the MDGs designed a more effective policy framework than the *Millennium Declaration*, agreed by the UN General Assembly.

#### **4.6.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

In relation to hypothesis one (rational synoptic) this finding does not support it. Yes, elite policy actors used rational capacities to select MDG2, but not the rational, unbiased, comprehensive approach described by the theory. In relation to hypothesis two (critical) this finding supports it because elite policy actors, almost all development professionals, selected MDG2. Neither developing countries nor educators had much, if any, say in the selection of MDG2 and it cannot reasonably be claimed that MDG2 represents world opinion. In relation to hypothesis three (world society) this finding strongly supports it. MDG2 was selected because of the influence of a shared culture among development professionals that primary schooling was a good model of education and that universal primary education was good policy. However, to qualify this, the General Assembly were at odds with development professionals at times.

## 4.7 The economic side- addressing poverty in the existing global hegemony

“There was consultation, but not that much.

We did consult with people and agencies on the economic side” (Hayley).

Policy actors from the ‘economic side’ played a crucial role in the MDG selection process and the inclusion of universal primary education. These actors included OECD DAC, the IMF and the World Bank, in close cooperation with the UN Secretariat. Accompanying this was a gradual drift toward priorities that fit within the neo-liberal paradigm, dominant in global policy processes at the time (Jolly et al 2009). Under this paradigm equal opportunities are emphasised more than equal outcomes, and investment in human capital is emphasised as paving the way for the private sector. Universal primary education fits within that dominant paradigm thus increasing the likelihood of its selection. Other priorities that focussed on more equal outcomes, such as elimination of debt and elimination of trade barriers, were toned down or excluded. It appears that the selection of MDG2 was part of an attempt to address poverty within the existing dominant global hegemony.

The sequence of events and interviews show that OECD DAC, the IMF and the World Bank played a crucial role in having education on the development agenda and selecting formal primary schooling as the preferred model. Giancarlo said that it was only because the head of UNICEF, Jim Grant, successfully convinced the World Bank to get on board with child development that there was a World Conference on Education at Jomtien in 1990. Giancarlo said that it required OECD DAC to come up with goals in the 90’s for the IMF and World Bank to come on board with the MDGs. At the World Education Forum at Dakar in 2000 the World Bank president promoted universal primary education as a fast track education initiative (Max). The UN Secretary General, OECD DAC, the IMF and World Bank included universal primary education in *A Better World for All*. The same goals were included in the draft *Millennium Declaration*, amongst other priorities.

OECD DAC, the World Bank and IMF are open about their role in supporting these global development goals. Paris 21, an organization founded and governed by the UN,

the European Commission, OECD DAC, the IMF, and the World Bank (Paris 21, 2015) in relation to *A Better World for All* state “The report focuses on seven interrelated development goals, which would eventually evolve into the Millennium Development Goals”.

Likewise Kofi Annan is open and clear about his purposeful engagement of business and the private sector in setting development priorities from 1997 onward. According to him “From my very first weeks in the job, I began giving speeches to business audiences around the world to sell the message that the UN was open, as never before, for engagement with private enterprise” (2012, p. 218). According to Annan (2012) there was an ideological divide between (Socialist) Eastern and (Capitalist) Western views. There was “a lingering and deep distrust of business and private capital” (p.215) at the UN. Yet “the state of the world’s economy meant that any ideological aversion to allying with capitalism had to be forgotten” (p. 218). However Annan also criticised the equally “limited view formed on the other side: that globalization was a rising tide that would lift all boats” (p. 215) because it led to the mistaken idea that development aid could be replaced by private investment.

Kofi Annan is also open about his engagement of the IMF and World Bank. In the first months of his tenure he “organized a breakfast with James Wolfensohn, the president of the World Bank, and Michel Camdessus, the managing director of the IMF. From that early meeting, we developed a relationship that over the next decade catalyzed an unprecedented level of cooperation among our three institutions” (2012, p. 221). For Annan “if there was ever to be any kind of cohesive, global effort to face extreme poverty, then these two institutions would need to be involved” (p. 221). So it is not surprising that they would influence policy outcomes. Interviewees Luca, Max, Claudia, Giancarlo, Tim and Hayley all said that the World Bank, IMF and OECD were highly influential throughout the policy process. Although there was no evidence found in this study that the USA (G-1) was involved in influencing MDG outcomes. The evidence was to the contrary, with the USA representative to the UN questioning the validity of the *Road Map Annex*. In this sense, a claim that the MDGs were a pro-rich conspiracy is doubtful, given the dominant position of the USA at the time.

The 'economic side' also exerts influence by the power relationship they have with policy actors. Lukes (2005) uses the example of pollution issues in Gary, Indiana where US Steel, due to its sheer reputation and weight, kept the issue of air pollution off the agenda for years. Interviewee Monica said "It is not about men in dark rooms smoking cigars and making deals. It is not about collusion or deliberate anti-development strategies... or conspiracy against the poor. But... the emerging properties of a system that influence what people in that system do and how they do it". According to Giancarlo, the World Bank "are almost all economists. The World Bank is overwhelmingly neo-liberal. They are schooled in a field that reinforces that they are right, that economics is science and that people who don't agree with them are ignorant. The World Bank is proud of the fact that it does not take country context into account". This illustrates how the sheer weight and power of the World Bank influences policy actors in a subtle yet real way. The World Bank had a long-standing commitment to universal primary education (Psacharopoulos 2006). Policy actors determining the list MDGs were aware of this (Hayley, Luca). The World Bank, because of their influential position and long standing commitment to universal primary education, exercised power.

The prominent role of the World Bank and IMF is also partly accounted for by UNESCO's lack of effectiveness and its struggle to maintain its position in multilateral policy processes through the 1990's. UNESCO should be central to UN policy processes concerning education, as education is core to UNESCO's mission. However UNESCO struggled to keep a humanistic vision of education in the midst of strong tendency toward functionalist and economic approaches (Mundy 1999). According to Mundy UNESCO has remained the most democratic of organisations yet its educational activities became "both increasingly diverse, and steadily less affective" (p. 48). Max commented on the lack of funding for UNESCO as well as perception by the World Bank and IMF in the EFA process that "UNESCO would not achieve much".

#### **4.7.1 Policy text paradigms**

Careful coding and analysis of policy texts and using the CDA method also supports the finding that the 'economic side' had a strong influence in the process. Policy texts fall into two categories, reflecting two fundamental paradigms<sup>18</sup>. The first, a social

---

<sup>18</sup> As per Heidenheimer (1982)

democratic paradigm, the second, a neo-liberal paradigm. It was in the second group of texts where the refined list of 8 MDGs, including universal primary education, was consistently included.

To explain the first category, it emphasises “social-democratic concerns about social justice in provision and outcomes in education” (Rizvi and Lingard 2006, p. 259). Under this, education serves a social and democratic purpose as well as an economic purpose. Held (2004) situates the social-democratic paradigm as a counter point to the Washington consensus. Texts include: the *World Declaration on Education* (Dakar 2000), the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) and the *World Summit Outcome* (2005). Parts of the text *Investing in Development* (2005) also reflect this paradigm. Organizations that largely influenced these texts were the UN General Assembly, UNESCO, ECOSOC, NGOs and the UN Millennium Project. Appendix 1 shows the presence of these themes.

The second paradigm is the neo-liberal (Western) paradigm. That is a particular approach promoting investment in human capital, free market economies, capitalism, the reduction of state ownership of resources and services toward privatisation and new public management techniques<sup>19</sup>. It emphasises equality of opportunity, not equality of outcomes (Buchanan 1988). Education is regarded as an economic and development tool, with little discussion of its social and democratic impact. The second group of policy texts include: *Shaping the 21st Century* (1996), *A Better World for All* (2000), the *Road Map Annex* (2001) and parts of *Investing in Development* (2005). It is in these texts that a refined list of development goals and universal primary education is consistently included. The UN Secretary General, the UN Secretariat, the IMF, the World Bank and OECD DAC influenced this second category of texts. The G7, World Trade Organisation, UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UN Development Programme, UN Development Group (including WHO and UNCTAD) also contributed to these texts. As far as this research has been able to establish, none of the texts in this second category were voted on by the General Assembly.

Coding of policy texts also showed a gradual shift toward priorities such as equality of opportunity, investment in human capital and new public management. To illustrate

---



this, the theme 'poverty and economy' makes up 24% of the coded themes in the *Millennium Declaration* (agreed to by the General Assembly). Yet, 5 years later, in the Millennium Project's *Investing in Development* (2005), it makes up 44% of coded themes, with that increase mostly made up of new sub-themes not used in previous texts<sup>20</sup>. These sub-themes are reflective of new public management priorities<sup>21</sup> (see footnote). For Ilcan this trend encourages developing countries "to provide free and compulsory primary education... to make the poor responsible for devising their own strategies for eradication of poverty and exclusion... It facilitates the process of making the poor responsible for their poverty" (2006, p. 863). So from a social-democratic perspective this trend is problematic (Although from a neo-liberal perspective this trend is unproblematic).

Accompanying the shift toward neo-liberal priorities in Group 2 texts was a shift away from social democratic priorities. For example, adopting a policy of duty- and quota-free access for essentially all exports from the least developed countries was in the *Millennium Declaration*. This policy would allow the least developed countries to export their goods to developed countries without imposed duties and quotas, improving their competitive capacities. By the *Road Map Annex* (2001) this policy was relegated to an explanatory note under 'addressing the needs of the least developed countries'. By *Investing in Development* (2005) it had been removed altogether.

Likewise, more generous official development assistance (ODA) was part of the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) and included in the *Road Map Annex* (2001). Yet again, by the final version of the MDG policy text from 2008 onward, it had been removed. Another example is the implementation of an enhanced programme of debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries without further delay that ended up neither as a goal nor target<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>20</sup> *Investing in Development* (2005) chapter promoting private sector involvement. The text toned down or did not discuss: halving proportion of people whose income is below \$1 per day (target 1), special needs of least developed countries, debt relief, cancellation of debt and more generous ODA (target 13), special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (target 14), dealing comprehensively with debt problems making debt sustainable (target 15), strategies for decent and productive work (target 16).

<sup>21</sup> New sub-themes were: Providing conditions for private sector success, relationship of private sector to economic growth, contribution of private sector, decentralization, capital accumulation, investment, investment cluster, investment oil and gas, private investment, public investment, free market economy, capacity building, infrastructure, capital accumulation, finance and financing.

<sup>22</sup> See *Investing in Development*, p.197. No mention of debt cancellation.

The purposeful shift toward the neo-liberal paradigm and exclusion of more socially democratic priorities, addressing structural issues both at a national and global level, was interpreted by some interviewees as excluding strategies that combat the root causes of poverty. As an example Luca said that MDG1 called for eradication of poverty, yet the target attached to it only called for a reduction of the proportion of people living on less than \$1 per day (later \$1.25). According to Luca the target of “\$1 per day is nonsense. Most of us did not want it to be part of the MDGs. Most of us said no... But the World Bank, being the World Bank, they got their way, they got it through”. Luca described the \$1 per day target as sneaky because it means that rich countries do not have to address poverty. “It’s the only target where an indicator is part of it... that got slipped in under the carpet” (Luca). For Luca, this “gives the illusion that we are together- but we are segregated. Therefore the UN leadership is failing the world community. These gimmicks have to be exposed”. For Giancarlo “Greater equity is part of development, but that has never been accepted by the World Bank and IMF”. Also, for Giancarlo, you cannot just look at education in isolation. The economy, the political situation, the country and the region affect the degree of success of achievement of goals, including education.

No interviewees were saying the ‘economic side’ should not be involved, but their domination of the MDG process lead to a narrowing of goals, a narrowing of interpretation of goals and a gradual erosion of priorities focussing on more equal social and economic outcomes. Related to this Jolly et al (2009) raise concern about an uncritical acceptance of the Washington consensus. For them, between the 1950s and 1980’s, developing countries achieved more development than was expected when the UN was set up, but since the 1980’s the Bretton Woods institutions (the IMF and World Bank) have come to dominate. In that time Asia and East Asia had accelerated, having largely ignored the Bretton Woods objectives<sup>23</sup>, and many countries forced to follow the Bretton Woods objectives had stagnated or gone backwards. Between 1960 and 1980 in Latin America the growth in per capita income was 80% yet between 1980 and 2000 it fell to just 9%. In the same periods in Sub-

---

<sup>23</sup> International monetary relations and trading system established by allied nations during World War 2. The World Bank Group and IMF were established as a result of the Bretton Woods agreement.

Saharan Africa, growth in per capita income between 1960 and 1980 was 36% yet between 1980 and 2000 fell to a staggering minus 15% (Jolly et al 2009).

The neo-liberal emphasis of the policy text *A Better World for All* (2000) and the heavy criticism that it met with are also an example of interpreting the MDGs neo-liberal trend as compromising pro-poor priorities. Luca said a controversial section in the text “was drafted by the World Bank guys. We struggled with it. We fought and fought and fought with the Bank- but foolishly enough, after a while, we signed off on it. We thought we had brought it back to a middle neo-liberal position, but we hadn’t, we were right of that”. The text was renamed *Bretton Woods for All* by conference delegates (RORG, 2004). A letter by Rev. Dr Konrad Raiser (Chair, World Council of Churches) to Secretary General Kofi Annan regarding the same stated:

“This report was received with great astonishment, disappointment and even anger by many representatives of civil society and of non-governmental organizations ... this consternation... was aroused by your participation in what amounted to a propaganda exercise for international finance institutions whose policies are widely held to be at the root of many of the most grave social problems facing the poor all over the world and especially those in the poor nations” (Raiser, 2004).

#### **4.7.2 The link between the neo-liberal paradigm and universal primary education**

The relationship between the growing prominence of the neo-liberal paradigm and the selection of universal primary education needs explanation. Hall (1993) put forward that policy actors are more likely to “resist pressure from societal interests when they are armed with a coherent policy paradigm” (p. 290). MDG2 fits the dominant neo-liberal policy paradigm, emphasising equal opportunity more so than an equal outcomes/welfare model (Heidenheimer 1982). Universal primary education provides a literate and obedient workforce, capable of performing low-tech jobs. Some of the policy texts reflect these assumptions. In particular, *Investing in Development* (2005) establishes a causal chain of solutions to poverty, starting from improved nation-state governance, to the provision of a low skilled workforce through primary education, to the use of public funding for improved infrastructure, which then paves the way for private sector investment. Once the infrastructure and capacities are in place, then it is

over the private sector, to provide the opportunity for individuals to succeed (see *Investing in Development* pp. 46-52).

To finish this section with an important qualification: it should be no surprise that the OECD, World Bank and IMF supported and perpetuated a neo-liberal policy paradigm. They are clear and open about this. During the 1990's the World Bank believed that rate of return on primary education was superior to other sectors (Psacharopoulos 2006). From their perspective at the time, competitive free market economies and neo liberal/ new public management strategies, supported by education, pave the way for economic growth. Strategies to provide more equitable outcomes were excluded. This is consistent with Giancarlo's observation that the World Bank has never accepted equity as a priority. Also, policy texts are not exclusively neo-liberal, it is just that the combination of priorities went progressively toward that paradigm.

This finding remains clear. The texts influenced by the 'economic side' are more neo-liberal in orientation than those by the UN General Assembly or UNESCO. This reflects their dominant role in the policy process and also the dominant global economic and social hegemony at the time. Policy actors selected development priorities, such as universal primary education, which fitted within that hegemony, making universal primary education more likely to be selected and difficult to argue against.

#### **4.7.3 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

In relation to hypothesis one (rational synoptic), this finding supports it to the extent that the IFI's were open and clear about their position in relation to neo-liberalism. They openly promoted their position in a series of policy texts and at conferences. There is still no evidence that the selection of MDG2 used the rational synoptic paradigm. This finding supports hypothesis two (critical) in so far as priorities aimed at delivering more equal outcomes were gradually excluded. OECD DAC, the IMF and World Bank were highly influential in the selection of MDG2. There is potentially a concerning correlation between following the Washington consensus (neo-liberal economics) and exacerbating the gap between rich and poor (Jolly et al 2009), leaving the poor further behind (Pogge 2010). In relation to hypothesis three this finding supports it but with a qualification. Whilst there is no evidence of controversy around

the selection of universal primary education, it was not accepted by all policy actors to the exclusion of secondary, tertiary and technical education.

## **4.8 An effective strategy**

“We had crafted something crisp, covering the spectrum, and sufficiently concrete to be meaningful. Short and punchy enough to be effective” (Hayley).

The last finding of this research is that there were significant advantages in having goals that were limited in number, understandable, actionable and measurable. Therefore MDG2 was selected because it was “short and punchy enough to be effective” (Hayley). The global community could understand the MDGs and people were held to account for their delivery. Vandermoortele states “Despite their limitations, global targets have energized many stakeholders across the world” (2011, p. 17).

Kofi Annan said that when he started as Secretary General in 1997 he had spent much of his life “observing the global development agenda wind its way through a long and grinding journey. It had not come far. Plans for poverty eradication and international development cooperation had spent most of the twentieth century in a stillbirth cycle: laudable imaginings repeatedly crushed by the thrust of power in the international system” (2012, p. 212). For Annan “The major development summits and conferences of the 1990’s... had seen the adoption of resolutions that were complex, opaquely worded, and made no real demands on anyone... They saw little substantive follow up” (p. 223). But the “The MDGs soon became the overarching framework for the entire international development agenda” (Annan 2012, p. 227).

Nine out of 10 interviewees in this research expressed similar thoughts, supporting the formulation of a limited set of achievable goals. For Max the goals “Got in people’s heads... In the midst of the rhetoric you can take the religious high ground, but you can also recognise issues like poverty, coalesce around goals and achieve something”. Max said “the Education for All process ... was trying to articulate broader policy” but it was less successful. This point is also supported by Unterhalter (2014). Giancarlo said “Go for the goals. If somebody asks me ‘should we have goals?’ I say

yes. ‘Should we press for them to be there between 2015-2030? I say yes’. For Hayley the MDGs “presented, in a simplified manner, something extremely complex. They reached the heart and imagination of people”. Leopoldo said “The selection criteria were quite simple. Choose areas that are highly desirable and consequential, but which are not wildly out of reach”. Luca said “Looking back we succeeded. I am surprised the MDGs are still there... at least something was achieved”.

Authors other than those directly involved in the process, such as Jolly et al (2009), also report the successes of the MDGs and of UN goals over an extended period. They do not deny the inadequacies and failures of the UN, but challenge a view of the UN as a “travelling circus, a talk shop, and paper-pushing enterprise” (p. 1). According to Jolly et al, such an uneven view does not adequately acknowledge the UN’s “goals and achievements” (p.1), of which there are many. For Jolly et al “Goal setting is one of the major UN contributions to national development over the last fifty years” (p. 87). In the first development decade a goal of 5% economic growth per year was set, and subsequently dismissed as unrealistic. In fact these goals were exceeded (Jolly et al). The UN has set about 50 development goals in its history. “The actual record of achievements has varied by goal and by period, usually far from full achievement, but rarely a total failure. On the whole, more successes have occurred than people realise” (Jolly et al, p. 88). The World Bank and IMF’s acceptance of goals represented an important change, because prior to that “the World Bank and the IMF never accepted UN goals” (Jolly et al 2009, p. 88).

A weakness in this finding is that one could question from whose perspective the policy was a success. To do this would require reliable comprehensive data from the countries affected by the policy. Whilst judging the success of MDG2 is outside the bounds of this study, still the finding that many policy actors regarded selection of a limited number of goals as successful is relevant, because it helps justify the selection of MDG2.

#### **4.8.1 Relationship of finding to hypotheses**

This finding supports hypothesis one (rational synoptic) in so far as elite policy actors regarded the selection of a limited number of goals as an effective strategy. The finding does not support hypothesis two (critical) because it shows that elite policy

actors regarded the substantial achievement of imperfect goals as better than little or no achievement of more comprehensive goals. The finding strongly supports hypothesis three (world society), because goals that were limited in number, understandable, actionable and measurable reflected the shared assumptions of the development community at the time.

### **Summary**

This chapter set out to explain research findings. Firstly, it provided a chart of key events and texts in the policy process. Findings then demonstrated that the selection of universal primary education was a common sense choice for a range of policy actors. The MDGs were selected as part of an effort to strengthen the UN. Yet a stronger UN was also required to achieve the goals. It also reinforced the role of development professionals. The chapter showed that MDG2 survived a complex and opaque policy process, arguably from at least as far back as 1996, through to 2015. The key to its survival was making to the *Road Map Annex* in 2001. This chapter demonstrated that elite policy actors and especially the 'economic side' played a crucial role in the selection of MDGs and MDG2. MDG2 fitted within the neo-liberal paradigm, making it more likely to be selected. The particular model of education, formal primary schooling, was accepted somewhat un-reflexively as a model applicable in all developing country contexts. Coupled with this was the virtual absence of developing country and education community voices. Finally, this research found that nine out of 10 interviewees regarded the selection of a limited number of understandable, actionable and measurable goals as an effective strategy.

With that now we turn to the evaluation of the hypotheses in light of the findings, and evaluation of the explanatory capacity of the three theories in relation to this case study.

## 5: Hypotheses evaluation and implications for theory

This chapter discusses how effectively each of the three hypotheses explains the selection of universal primary education. It evaluates the theoretical frameworks from which the hypotheses were drawn. It will show that each hypothesis shed light on different aspects of MDG2's selection. The chapter will draw conclusions about theory in relation to this case study, arguing that using multiple theories strengthened it.

### 5.1 Hypothesis one- rational synoptic theory

This first hypothesis was based on a rational synoptic theory. It proposed that MDG2 was an effective strategy selected as a part of a rational policy process to reverse the grinding poverty, hunger and disease affecting millions. The policy process engaged specialists in providing reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of global challenges and opportunities, particularly in relation to poverty.

This section will show that the findings in some ways supported and some ways contradicted hypothesis one. Overall, hypothesis one was weak in explaining MDG2's selection.

Table 5.1, below, shows the indicators supporting hypothesis one and whether or not evidence of those indicators was present in the findings. Justification of ratings for indicators is provided in Appendix 7.

Table 5.1: *Indicators* supporting rational synoptic theory hypothesis

1.	<i>MDG2 selection based on a broad or synoptic view of the information available to policy actors.</i>	No
2.	<i>Policy process was collective action of individuals, groups, organisations and nation-states.</i>	No
3.	<i>Clear, time bound targets, transferred into action.</i>	Yes



4.	<i>Universal primary education as part of a successful tradition of goal setting and accountability structures that deliver progress.</i>	Yes
5.	<i>Purposeful action on the part of development professionals with relevant expertise.</i>	Yes
6.	<i>Policy actors using rational, empirically grounded scientific understanding and data, unbiased, complex and full analysis in selecting MDG2.</i>	No
7.	<i>Legitimate, transparent, accountable decision making.</i>	No
8.	<i>Addressing poverty as persistent and central policy concern.</i>	Yes/No

### 5.1.1 Evaluation of hypothesis one

Supporting hypothesis one was a long established synoptic view that developing countries will require and will benefit from universal primary education. That view is evidenced in a long-standing UN commitment to it. Most policy actors interviewed also held the overarching synoptic view that developing countries would benefit from universal primary education. Given the support for universal primary education, it would have been difficult to argue against it as a policy priority. It is important to note however that on that same basis secondary, technical and tertiary education had also been long-standing policy priorities. Therefore it becomes more difficult to argue that the selection of universal primary education, to the exclusion of other sectors, was based on reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas.

Hypothesis one is also consistent with statements of policy actors and policy texts that present the policy as a rational response to alleviation of poverty and suffering. Presenting the policy process in such a way adds legitimacy to it. Whilst knowing intentions and motivations is difficult, the policy texts refer to reversing grinding poverty, hunger and disease affecting millions. The scale of activities, the tone of documents such as *Investing in Development* (2005) and ongoing measurement of progress against targets, demonstrate commitment to delivering on the 8 MDGs.

Policy actors lauded the use of a limited number of understandable, actionable and measurable time bound goals as an effective strategy, part of a successful tradition of goal setting and accountability structures that have delivered results. Policy actors said

they were concerned that the *Millennium Declaration* was so broad as to be unachievable (Luca, Hayley, Paul). Interviewees Max, Giancarlo, Tim, Leopoldo, Monica and Tony were complimentary of identifying a limited number of well-defined goals that were understood by the broader community. The only exception was Claudia, who gave no indication of the achievements of the process and described it as a “snow job”, cloaking the interests of the global elite in humanitarian values. On balance, policy actors interviewed regarded the selection of 8 MDGs as an effective strategy. This fits well in the rational synoptic theory.

There was a widely shared synoptic view by policy actors that developing countries needed and would benefit from universal primary education. For Paul “It was a no-brainer”. The policy process of the General Assembly had strong elements of the rational synoptic model. There was a proposal by the Secretary General in 1997 to focus and strengthen work of the UN and to host a Millennium Summit to that end. There was a multi layer approach to preparing for the Millennium Summit reflecting rational synoptic theory. For these reasons, there appears to be a measure of support for the rational synoptic model.

There are also findings that contradict hypothesis one. MDG2’s selection was not based on reliable, unbiased, complex and full analysis of social dilemmas. Most policy actors interviewed took for granted that there was going to be something on education and almost certainly primary education (Luca, Max, Giancarlo, Tim, Hayley, Leopoldo). This is illustrated by Paul’s response to hypothesis one, that

“It misses the degree to which policy actors see themselves as strongly progressive activists who have devoted their lives to this. Imagine someone like Richard Jolly as an example. For him universal primary education has a deep moral commitment. Kofi Annan is another example, it misses the political role that he has to advance the UN and the UN Charter. I know him, he is a person deeply committed to these causes. So the hypothesis misses the relevance of what I will call moral entrepreneurship”.

Universal primary education also survived a complex process involving power struggles, interest groups and complex interactions that interviewees discussed. Luca,

Claudia and Giancarlo were concerned about what they believed to be a disproportionate influence of the World Bank, IMF and OECD in this regard.

Also contradicting hypothesis one was the crucial role of the policy elite, particularly development professionals, in selecting MDG2. They were acting beyond their mandate and they knew it. This was evidenced in their “sneaking” in of priorities (Luca, Hayley) and in the parallel processes of setting the agenda and framing the decision-making possibilities (Annan 2012). Ultimately development professionals determined the priorities. As late as 2005 the General Assembly was still referring to the *Millennium Declaration* as the policy text. Whereas development professionals had long since regarded the 8 MDGs from the *Road Map Annex* as the text. If the policy process were following the rational synoptic model, then the parallel process that determined the 8 MDGs would not have prevailed. If, from a rational synoptic perspective, UN decisions are primarily those of nation states, then MDG2 should have been selected by the General Assembly. Later the UN Secretariat and the Millennium Project gave the misleading impression, carefully worded, that the UN General Assembly had unanimously agreed to the 8 MDGs. The study has found no evidence that they did.

There was also a gap between the stated intentions and motivations in policy texts and which topics inner circle policy actors mostly addressed in interviews. The priorities that later became MDGs trace back earlier than the *Millennium Declaration*. For Hayley the reference point for the MDGs were the 7 goals selected for *A Better World for All* prior to the Millennium Summit. Paul also said that for the small group deciding the list of MDGs “The *Millennium Declaration* was the bible” but that “The IDGs were what we used to boil down from the *Millennium Declaration*”. According to these interviewees’ evidence selection of MDG2 did not match the rational synoptic model.

In support of hypothesis one, policy actors made decisions in reference to global challenges and opportunities. There were repeated references to addressing poverty. Policy actors used rational capacities. Contrary to hypothesis one, the findings show that the process leading to the selection of MDG2 did not reflect the rational synoptic paradigm. Policy actors did not use comprehensive evidence to develop a synoptic view of the social, economic and political context. There was not examination and

rational checking of policy alternatives. It is fair to state that the policy process did not reflect the rational synoptic paradigm in an explanatory sense.

### **5.1.2 Implications of findings for rational synoptic theory**

Rational synoptic theory brought the elements of the policy process to light that matched the rational synoptic paradigm. It let the policy process speak on the terms in which it was presented to the broader public. There were proposals to the General Assembly (in 1997 and 1998), a synthesis of 1990's agreements in the *Millennium Declaration* (2000) and unanimous approval of the *Millennium Declaration* by the General Assembly (2000). There were specialists engaged to produce practical means of achieving the goals, policy actors making decisions in reference to global challenges and opportunities, and the use of rational capacities and systematic processes by the group that determined the *Road Map Annex*.

Using rational synoptic theory the case study was able to trace the widely accepted view of the benefits of universal primary education. This was evidenced in a long-standing UN commitment to universal primary education tracing back to *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948. The study also showed that the World Bank's long-standing commitment to universal primary was clear and open, supported by rate of return calculations, although these have since been revised. The first hypothesis highlighted the shared perception among policy actors interviewed of the effectiveness of choosing a limited number of clear and understandable goals. This single case study found rational synoptic theory useful in highlighting aspects of the policy process that matched the rational synoptic paradigm.

Yet there were substantial limitations to the rational synoptic theory as an explanatory theory in this study. Whilst the decisions of the General Assembly, on the surface at least, followed the rational synoptic paradigm, the selection of MDG2 through a parallel process was largely at odds with it. There was sneaking of priorities into texts, hidden politics and the non-linear nature of the real decision making forums. There was a cloaking of various interests and motivations with universal humanitarian values. There was also no overarching or synoptic analysis of developing country needs; rather, 1990's UN agreements were used as the reference point for MDG selection. From an

objective, rational point of view, there is also no justification for why most priorities from the *Millennium Declaration* were left out.

Based on this case study, it is difficult to share Sabatier's (2007) view that rational theories have outlived their explanatory adequacy. Although the theory was weak in explaining aspects of the process that did not match what the theory proposed in an imperative sense. In conclusion, rational synoptic theory has substantial limitations in terms of its ability to explain MDG2's selection.

## 5.2 Hypothesis two- critical theory

Hypothesis two, from a critical theory perspective, proposed that: MDG2 was selected as part of an undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process. It represented a downward revision of 1990's EFA targets, diverting resources away from secondary and higher education, relegating developing countries to the intellectual periphery and making them less able to compete on world markets. Therefore MDG2 did not represent world opinion, but reinforced the UN's role as part of a ruling apparatus, reinforced the existing global ruling hegemony and served the interests of the powerful.

Table 5.2: *Indicators supporting critical theory hypothesis*

1.	<i>Undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process.</i>	Yes
2.	<i>Policy process largely irrational but presented as rational.</i>	Yes and No
3.	<i>Downward revision of goals and targets set in the Education for All process (Jomtien, Dakar).</i>	No
4.	<i>Evidence that resources were purposefully diverted away from secondary and higher education.</i>	No
5.	<i>Gradual erosion of pro developing country policy priorities.</i>	Yes and No
6.	<i>Policy decisions serving developed country and private sector interests.</i>	Yes
7.	<i>Relatively stable and shared pro developed country priorities by dominant policy actors.</i>	No

8.	<i>Claiming world-opinion and pro poor to justify decisions and conceal other interests and motivations.</i>	Yes
9.	<i>Policy decisions made by dominant policy actors without evidence that decisions reflect world opinion.</i>	Yes
10.	<i>Developing countries have little or no say in MDG2 selection.</i>	Yes
11.	<i>Policy process driven by elite policy actors/ development professionals, who ensure an expansion of the scale of UN activities.</i>	Yes
12.	<i>Unequal power relationships reproduce themselves in the policy process.</i>	Yes
13.	<i>Policy reinforcing existing global ruling hegemony including neo-liberal priorities such as market fundamentalism of self-regulating markets dis-embedded from the social context and new public management.</i>	Yes
14.	<i>Education used to pave the way for private sector interests.</i>	Yes

### 5.2.1 Evaluation of hypothesis two

The finding that MDG2 was selected by an elite group of policy actors, in a process behind closed doors, supports hypothesis two. Almost all of the priorities that became MDGs were already identified in 1996 and 2000 in the IDGs. Effectively the IDGs constituted most of what became the MDGs. The main reason given for taking this course of action was that elite policy actors feared that the *Millennium Declaration* would follow the path of other General Assembly agreements and achieve little. They did not want to lose the good ideas contained in the IDGs. Hayley and Annan (2012) also stated concern that the complexity of the UN system would hinder the development of a cohesive and effective development policy.

As discussed in the evaluation of hypothesis one, there was also a difference between the stated purpose of the MDGs, ending poverty, and what policy actors at the elite level spoke about in the interviews. Elite policy actors talked mostly about UN policy processes and the politics of the development community and highlighted the need to strengthen the UN to deliver the policy. This theme was prominent in policy texts between 1997 and the *Road Map* in 2001. After 2001 it disappeared entirely from the policy texts. A stronger UN was needed to deliver the development agenda. Striving to

develop a stronger UN also provided career opportunities for development professionals. It appears the process leading to the refined list of 8 MDGs and to MDG2 was undemocratic and opaque and supports hypothesis two. World leaders did not select the MDGs and MDG2. However this does not mean that policy actors purposefully selected priorities to harm developing countries or to relegate them to the intellectual periphery. This study found no evidence of that.

Supporting hypothesis two also was the finding that developing countries had little or no direct say in the selection of MDGs. Therefore developing countries had little or no say in the selection of MDG2. One interviewee spoke of influential people in the G77 (representing developing countries) at a breakfast meeting regarding MDG8. Yet certainly developing countries were not at the table with those who determined the refined list of MDGs that were included in the *Road Map Annex*. As shown also, verbatim records of General Assembly discussion of the *Road Map* indicated that nation-state representatives had little awareness of the *Road Map Annex* and little or no awareness that universal primary education was going to be selected without other educational sectors. There are indications from the current UN Secretary General, Ban Ki Moon (2014), that this will not be repeated in the SDG process. He states “The discussion on the post-2015 sustainable development agenda has stressed the importance of the specific conditions in each country” (UN Secretary General 2014, p.8).

There was also the gradual exclusion of targets to address structural issues like elimination of debt, increasing ODA and elimination of protections, duties and tariffs. These aimed to deliver more equal outcomes. Their exclusion happened concurrently with the direct and substantial influence of the ‘economic side’, that is OECD DAC, the IMF, World Bank, UNDP and development professionals. The exclusion of these priorities protected the interests of developed countries and had a greater chance of maintaining status quo and global balance of power and distribution of wealth. The gradual exclusion in the policy process of targets of addressing these structural issues is a serious matter, especially in light of the nearly 1 billion people living in less than \$1 per day at the time. These priorities were included in the *Millennium Declaration* in 2000, unanimously agreed to by world leaders. Yet subtly, quietly and gradually, over a 5-year period, these were excluded from the policy agenda.

Over time neo-liberal priorities became more dominant. Policy actors stated that whilst there was not much consultation in selecting the 8 MDGs, they did consult the 'economic side' (Luca, Giancarlo, Hayley). It was the IMF, World Bank, WTO and UN Secretariat that published the IDGs in *A Better World for All* (2000). Unequal power relationships between developed and developing countries, between multilateral organisations, donors and recipients, even between development professionals and the General Assembly, reproduced themselves in the policy process. Under this paradigm poverty became a developing country problem.

In relation to education, this study found that the EFA process included a broader set of educational goals than the MDGs policy process. From a critical theory perspective this narrowing of educational goals and targets from EFA to universal primary education and gender balance in enrolment, could represent a downward revision and narrowing in comparison with EFA priorities. There is no evidence that policy actors considered the EFA priorities when selecting MDG2 and therefore no evidence of a purposeful narrowing of EFA targets. Rather EFA priorities were not on the table, UNESCO was not at the table and EFA was not considered. Policy actors used the IDGs as their reference point.

There were also findings that contradicted hypothesis two. Since 1948, the UN had openly and repeatedly supported universal primary education. Policy actors took the inclusion of MDG2 for granted. There was no evidence found in this study that policy actors intentionally diverted resources away from secondary and higher education to keep developing countries relegated to the intellectual periphery, or to make them less able to compete on world markets.

Also, it is unlikely that groups of nations and trans-national organisations developed a stable and shared set of priorities and motives. This is contrary to the assumption that the UN and related funds and agencies have relatively stable, rational and shared motives, or at least that they have the capacity for that (for example Escobar 2004, Ilcan 2006, Pogge 2010, Moutsios 2009, Ilcan and Phillips 2010). This study showed that there were multiple intentions influencing the policy process and multiple interests



being served in multiple layers. The ruling neo-liberal hegemony reinforced itself in the policy process and continued to dominate.

There was also no evidence that powerful country representatives had a direct say in MDG selection. One of the most powerful nation-states, the USA, questioned the legal status of the *Road Map Annex*. Although we can say that powerful country interests were represented by OECD-DAC.

A problematic aspect of hypothesis two was the inference that MDG2 would have been selected to relegate developing countries to the intellectual periphery and make them less able to compete on world markets. One interviewee in response to hypothesis two said “I think that’s rot” (Tim). Feedback by a supervisor on an earlier version of this research inquiry said that this particular aspect of hypothesis two might be ‘unsavoury’. Rather than re-working the hypothesis before submitting the research inquiry, this problematic aspect was addressed in the findings. There was not evidence of a unified pro-rich, anti-poor agenda on the part of powerful policy actors. The process was far more complex than that. However, there was a gradual and subtle erosion of priorities that would have helped developing countries compete on world markets, such as the elimination of trade barriers. That is cause for concern.

Hypothesis two showed that MDG2 was selected as part of an undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process. Yet there is no evidence that policy actors considered EFA in the policy process. There is no evidence that they purposefully took decisions to divert resources away from secondary and higher education, to relegate developing countries to the intellectual periphery, or to make them less able to compete on world markets. Rather, there was a subtle and gradual drift away from priorities that would have helped developing countries compete on world markets. The ‘economic side’ were heavily influential in this. Therefore the MDGs reinforced the existing global ruling hegemony and in that way served the interests of the powerful. MDG2 fit neatly within that hegemony. It showed that developing countries had little, if any say in MDG selection. It appears that the hypothesis was largely confirmed by this study, but with qualifications.

### **5.2.2 Implications of findings for critical theory**

In relation to this case study, critical theory shed light on the opaque aspects of the policy process, on disrupting the common sense and on injustice. The theory was useful in discovering the parallel process, controlled by elite policy actors who made the decisions. It was helpful in showing the exclusion of priorities aimed at addressing structural issues and aimed at providing more equal policy outcomes. Elite policy actors excluded priorities unanimously agreed to by the General Assembly. Critical theory was also helpful in showing how the policy process drifted gradually toward a neo-liberal framework, emphasising goals that provided opportunities for people to lift themselves from poverty, like MDG2. Use of critical theory also showed the gradual drift away from priorities addressing structural issues that looked to deliver more equal outcomes. It showed that OECD DAC, the IMF and World Bank, along with the UN Secretariat, were powerful policy actors. It helped show that developing countries were not at the table where elite policy actors decided on the list of 8 MDGs and hence MDG2, nor was the education community. Critical theory also provided the basis for analysis of prominent themes and patterns of decision-making. It helped uncover shifting priorities and contradictions in and between policy texts. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) provided the thematic basis for exploration of themes. Critical theory showed how the policy process reinforced the dominant global hegemony.

However, if this study had only used critical theory, reasons for the selection of MDG2 may have been missed. This includes consideration of the broader global context in 1990's agreements, the long-standing UN commitment to universal primary education and the deeply held conviction on the part of policy actors regarding the value of universal primary education. Critical theory helped explore what happened in the shadows, but was not as helpful at explaining what was happening in plain daylight.

A further difficulty of the use of critical theory was that the hypothesis aimed to test policy actor's intentions. This study did not prove intention. There was also a problematic aspect in the design of hypothesis two, that there could be shared and consistent intentions on the part of elite policy actors and multilateral organisations. The policy process was more complex than that. It involved multiple intentions, multiple priorities in complex interaction and at multiple layers. There were long standing policy trajectories and taken for granted UN policy process structures. These

factors affected policy outcomes in a dynamic way. Thus policy actor intentions were not well explained by the three theories used in this study.

In the end, however, critical theory showed that the dominant ruling hegemony prevailed and reinforced itself in the MDG process. This happened in a gradual way, heavily influenced by the 'economic side' but not by a unified and purposeful action of all elite policy actors.

### 5.3 Hypothesis three- world society theory

The world society theory hypothesis predicted that policy actors used a rational policy process, or at least the appearance of a rational process, which then dominated international relations. MDG2 was accepted with a remarkable consensus, despite the remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances of nation-states. Given that universal primary education had been a widely accepted policy priority for many years in established and powerful nation states embracing the Western hegemony and in the UN, it was not surprising that universal primary education was taken for granted by elite policy actors as a good policy for developing nations.

Table 5.3: *Indicators supporting world society theory hypothesis*

1.	<i>Policy actors used a rational policy process, or at least the appearance of a rational process.</i>	Yes and No
2.	<i>Policy values, norms and practices are those of Western modernity, including progress, justice and associated ideas of the state and the individual. Strong influence of neo-liberal priorities to justify the policy.</i>	Yes
3.	<i>UN as taken for granted forum for global policy decisions.</i>	Yes and No
4.	<i>The presence of coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism.</i>	Yes
5.	<i>A taken for granted-ness and remarkable consensus about universal primary education as a policy priority by decisions makers. Therefore a common sense choice without evidence of rational consideration of alternatives.</i>	Yes

6.	<i>Little or no consideration of remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances between nation-states.</i>	Yes
7.	<i>Professionalization of the field. Similar academic credentials and backgrounds of powerful policy actors. Therefore isomorphism of policy views, approaches and outcomes and crucial role of development professionals as policy elite determining policy outcomes.</i>	Yes
8.	<i>Uncritical acceptance of policy priorities that may be contradictory.</i>	Yes
9.	<i>UN as perpetuator and subject of widely accepted world society culture, reflective of Western hegemony.</i>	Yes
10.	<i>A worldwide, macro-phenomenological view of policy priorities.</i>	Yes

### 5.3.1 Evaluation of hypothesis three

Hypothesis three is strongly supported by the finding that universal primary education was accepted with a remarkable consensus by elite policy actors. There appears to have been very little debate amongst development professionals and even at the General Assembly about the value of universal primary education. There is no evidence that elite policy actors promoted other educational policy priorities in its place. Under the world society theory framework this can be attributed partly to professionalization of the field and the crucial role of development professionals as policy elite.

Coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism were evident in the policy process. Coercive isomorphism was evident in the central role of a handful of elite policy actors, who admitted that The Bank heavily influenced policy priorities and that policy actors were conniving with OECD. Mimetic and normative isomorphism was evidenced in the overarching neo-liberal policy paradigm in which the MDGs were situated. Policy values, norms and practices were those of Western modernity, including progress, justice and associated ideas of the state and the individual. Mimetic and normative isomorphism was also emphasised in a remarkable acceptance of formal primary schooling by elite policy actors as the preferred educational model, despite differences between nation-states.

Outside of elite policy actors, not all agreed with universal primary education. Some nation states promoted secondary, tertiary and technical education during debate of the *Road Map* (2001) and the World Summit (2005). There is evidence as late as 2005 that the General Assembly did not regard the 8 MDGs as the policy text. Despite this, the MDGs and MDG2 prevailed.

The acceptance of MDG2 and other policies was also somewhat uncritical, at least in regards to the process by elite policy actors who determined the *Road Map Annex*. This is evidenced by decisions that either excluded priorities essential to delivering on the goals or including contradictory priorities. Policy priorities such as poverty reduction, were kept, but key strategies to change the structural causes of poverty were excluded. Linked to this was the lack of consideration given to the remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances between developing countries. The uncritical acceptance by policy actors of MDG2 supports hypothesis three. People supported MDG2 because it was common sense to do so, based on shared assumptions. The widely accepted paradigm reflected assumptions regarding the effectiveness of the neo-liberalism and new public management in comparison with a welfare paradigm (as described by Heidenheimer 1982). It reflected the wide acceptance of a particular model of education. That is, formal primary schooling.

Strengthening the effectiveness of the UN as a reason for selecting the MDGs and MDG2 also shows an acceptance about the UN as a forum for global policy decisions. The UN also perpetuated world society culture. Reflecting a worldwide, macro-phenomenological view of how policy priorities should be determined.

However, a finding contradicting hypothesis three is related to the above. That is the influence of a parallel policy processes, controlled by development professionals and organisations. This was evidenced in the crucial role of development professionals in sneaking priorities into the *Road Map Annex* and hoping that nation-states did not notice. This shows that policy actors determining the *Annex* were aware that selecting a refined list of 8 MDGs was not a widely accepted approach by the General Assembly. Rather it was a generally accepted assumption in a sub-culture among development professionals and organisations. Development professionals and organisations had shared assumptions about values, about justice and about modern

narratives of progress. Partly, the perceived expectations of powerful policy actors such as the World Bank, IMF and powerful nations represented by the OECD, had an influence. Evidence of this was given by Hayley, who said that they did not consult much, but did consult with people on the 'economic side'. As well as by Luca, who spoke about the involvement of the economic side as an absolutely taken for granted part of higher level policy decision making. Yet Luca was critical of the World Bank in particular and its reinforcement of the ruling global hegemony. In relation to the IDGs Luca said "As usual, the Bank got its way". Therefore, to qualify the findings in relation to hypothesis three, policy decisions were made in an accepted process within the development community, but not accepted by the UN more broadly.

### **5.3.2 Implications of findings for world society theory**

The world society theory hypothesis most closely predicted *how* and *why* MDG2 came to be selected. Using world society theory this study found shared cultural assumptions about policy processes. It showed a remarkable acceptance among elite policy actors about the value of universal primary education as an appropriate model of education and as an effective development goal. At the same time there was a widespread acceptance by elite UN policy actors that the UN policy process would not achieve much. So interviewees said that they initiated a parallel process to ensure that that the *Millennium Declaration* achieved something. Neo-liberal priorities were widely accepted. More specifically there was wide agreement on a new public management approach to setting goals, targets and indicators and measurement of achievement as proposed in the *Road Map Annex*. The public face of the policy, as well as the new public management style of the *Road Map Annex* are well explained by a world society theory paradigm.

There were also limitations to the theory in this case study. There is an inherent difficulty in defining culture. Whilst we can say that the policy reflected a dominant world society culture, defining that culture is problematic. This study takes the position that neo-liberalism and Western rationalism was the dominant culture, but that is contestable if taken to include the whole UN system or even more broadly the global community. It is a fragile assertion that one dominant global culture could apply to a global population. However, with a qualification and adjustment, the theory did apply to the development community, who had similar educational backgrounds and cultural

assumptions. The theory held for the purposes of this case study, as long as it is clear that the widely shared assumptions were those of the development community. Any wider than that would have become problematic, because of the sheer complexity of culture and the complexity of policy processes.

Dale (2000) also raised limitations in relation to world society theory. For Dale the convergence of stated priorities may be a process or it may be an outcome of a phenomenon, but it is not clear which. This case study reinforced Dale's assertion. It was not possible, using world society, to establish reliable inferences regarding the causes of MDG2's selection. It can only be observed that the phenomenon has occurred. This study did not prove whether the selection of MDG2 was a cause or an outcome of shared cultural assumptions. So the *why* of the research question remained illusive.

## **5.4 Advantages of the theoretical dialogue**

The dialogue between the three theoretical frameworks strengthened findings. Each theory brought different aspects of the policy process to light. Each had different strengths in relation to answering the research question and each had different aspects of the policy process that it did not explain well. Using three theories brought to light what seemed, initially at least, like contradictory findings. For example critical theory showed the undemocratic and opaque aspects of the policy process. On the other hand rational synoptic and world society theories showed that universal primary education was a long-standing UN priority and deeply ingrained as a common sense choice on the part of policy actors. Whilst these findings were somewhat incommensurate, still further analysis led to the conclusion that an undemocratic and opaque policy process resulted in what policy actors regarded as a successful outcome. If policy actors had not selected 8 MDGs the democratic process of the General Assembly may well have led to the same lack lustre results as many 1990's agreements.

Of course the underlying assumptions of the three theories are different, but still none were true entirely to the exclusion of others. Despite these difficulties, I would argue that multiple theory analysis is appropriate and strengthened the case study. This is

because policy processes are themselves inherently complex, multi-layered and organic. We should expect that policy research is also complex. Policy is a messy process (Vidovich 2007), thus reinforcing Ball's view (1993) that complex policy processes require the use of multiple theories.

## **5.5 A new theory**

Whilst a combination of three theories shed light on various aspects of MDG2's selection and strengthened the study, the theories are based on fundamentally different assumptions. Therefore findings are still somewhat incommensurate.

As a study of a single policy process this was designed on the assumption that no new theory could be built based upon it. It was also designed on the assumption that findings would not be generalizable beyond it (as per de Vaus 2001, Yin 1989, Yin 2014). However, the case was broad. It involved multiple nation-states, multilateral agencies, organisations and groups of policy actors, individual actors, structures, trajectories and power relationships, in an inter-related global process. The process stretched over an extended period of time. This case is probably not what de Vaus and Yin were referring to when discussing a single case study. Therefore I propose that there is sufficient material in this case for developing a unique and more unified explanation of MDG2's selection. There is also sufficient material for attempting to build a new substantive theory based on that explanation. Work has started on this unique explanation and theory.

### **Summary**

The rational synoptic theory hypothesis was the least powerful in explaining the selection of MDG2. The critical theory hypothesis was illuminating in terms of the hidden aspects of the policy process and of the general trend toward neo-liberal priorities. However, it had a fundamental flaw in trying to establish shared intentionality by policy actors and in inferring that the MDGs could have been selected to relegate poorer countries to the periphery. The world society theory hypothesis most closely predicted how and why MDG2 came to be selected but was weak in establishing the causes of MDG2's selection. This chapter argues that multiple theory analysis strengthened this case study. At the same time none of the theories explained MDG2's selection entirely. Building a unique explanation and theory was not part of this



research inquiry's design, however this chapter argues that a unique explanation and theory relevant to this case would provide a more unified explanation.

## 6: Conclusion

Despite claims that world leaders voted unanimously in support of 8 Millennium Development Goals and associated targets, only a small number of the priorities agreed to in the *United Nations Millennium Declaration* (2000) made it to the final MDG list. This established a policy architecture. This research set out to establish *how* and *why* universal primary education came to be selected as a priority from among those original priorities.

The method used to answer the research question was a single case study using process tracing. This started with a literature review, focussing on three theoretical perspectives. Each was used to generate a unique hypothesis and to specify indicators that would confirm it. The current literature was limited in regards to MDG2's selection.

Following the literature review, data were gathered through careful coding of UN and related policy texts and other documents. These included UN resolutions, verbatim records of UN meetings, conference and summit outcomes and information contained on websites. MDGs were traced back through those texts. CDA was used to analyse themes.

Finally, nine elite policy actors agreed to be interviewed, one gave comments via email. Four of the policy actors who participated in this research were in the inner circle of decision makers. This proved exceptionally helpful.

Data were used to develop a chronological record of events and relationships map. The map aimed to identify relationships between policy actors, key mileposts of the policy process and policy texts. The relationships map was so complex that creation of it had to be abandoned. In itself, this abandonment supported a finding regarding the complexity of the process.

Data collection was designed to be thorough, comprehensive and systematic. There was also the organic element of following the clues. After this findings were established. The first was that universal primary education was selected in light of global challenges and opportunities, although not in the comprehensive rational sense of rational synoptic theory. MDG2 was a widely supported policy priority and a common sense choice among powerful many policy actors. It came to be selected by surviving a complex policy process. Within that, making it to the *Road Map Annex* was crucial. A policy elite, comprised of development professionals and trans-national organisations, determined the 8 MDGs and associated targets and indicators. The 'economic side' were highly influential in MDG selection. They promoted a policy paradigm reflective of the neo-liberal hegemony. There is no evidence that developing countries or the education community had much, if any, say in the selection of MDG2, nor was local context taken into account when formal primary education was selected as the preferred global model. Finally, this study found that elite policy actors widely regarded the selection of a limited number of measurable and achievable goals as effective.

## **6.1 Evaluation of hypotheses and theories**

Findings were used as the basis for evaluating hypotheses. Hypothesis one was helpful in explaining MDG2's selection. It showed that UN policy actors had a long-standing commitment to universal primary education. It highlighted the widely held view among policy actors that the selection of a limited number of measurable time bound goals was the right strategy. Also, it highlighted rational aspects of the General Assembly's approach to the policy process, yet these did not prevail. In so far as rational synoptic theory was used to explain the policy process it was limited, missing crucial reasons as to how and why MDG2 was selected.

Hypothesis two was helpful in showing that the policy process was asymmetric, undemocratic and opaque. It helped show a gradual exclusion of goals and targets focussed on more equal outcomes. These included reduction of debt, improved ODA and elimination of trade barriers and tariffs. At the same time, universal primary education fits more neatly within the paradigm of providing more equal opportunities, thus increasing the likelihood of its selection. Hypothesis two was also helpful in

showing how the selection of the MDGs and MDG2 reinforced the UN's role as part of a ruling apparatus, although this applied to UN development professionals and not to the UN more broadly. Yet this study found an inherent problem in the design of hypothesis two regarding policy actor intentions. There was no evidence found that MDG2 was selected to relegate poorer countries to the intellectual periphery and make them less able to compete on world markets. In relation to this study, critical theory was helpful. Yet if critical theory were used by itself it would have missed helpful findings, particularly the long-standing UN commitment to universal primary education and its remarkable acceptance by elite policy actors. Whilst generating policy alternatives was not central to the research question, nevertheless critical theory was helpful in developing constructive policy alternatives and recommendations for the SDG process. These are discussed briefly in this concluding chapter.

Hypothesis three (world society theory) most closely predicted how and why MDG2 was selected. The consensus among elite policy actors regarding the inclusion of both education and health priorities was remarkable. Within that there was a remarkable consensus regarding universal primary education as the preferred model. Also there was broad acceptance of neo-liberal priorities and wide agreement among elite policy actors regarding the new public management approach. Yet there were limitations to hypothesis three. Whilst policy priorities reflected a shared culture by development professionals, more broadly, the idea of a world society culture shaping the policy process was problematic. Defining what that culture was and how widely it was shared was not possible. Also a limitation of world society theory was that the convergence of MDG priorities may have been a process or it may have been an outcome, but it was not clear which. Therefore the *why* of the research question remained illusive. There was also a hidden and very powerful policy process going on behind the scenes, amongst development professionals and the 'economic side', which world society theory did not explain well. This limited the possibility of developing a reliable causal explanation under this theoretical framework.

## **6.2 Strengths of this case study**

Using case study method to trace a single policy process strengthened this study. The method had distinct advantages in answering this *how* and *why* question (Gerring

2004, Yin 2014). It left room for following a chain of evidence, going into depth, as well as being open to emerging directions. The method explored both structure and agency, considering what policy actors did and the context in which they were working. By organising data into a chronological record of events, attempting a relationships map and writing up the study as data gathering and analysis progressed, it was possible to establish key policy actors, key policy trends and reasons for MDG2's selection. As Gerring (2004) has noted, one of the "primary virtues of the case study method is the depth of analysis that it offers" (p.348). I propose therefore that using case study method yielded a "sensible, plausible account of events and in this way achieve(d) internal validity" (de Vaus 2001, p. 236).

This case study was also strengthened by a commitment to rigour. It used a wide range of instruments, a wide range of data and data analysis techniques. These included mapping associations and connections, chronological record of events, tracking of goals and priorities, coding of policy texts, tracking of dominant themes, critical discourse analysis and coding and analysis of interview records. These sources were brought together through mind mapping and through writing numerous iterations of this research inquiry to reach findings. At a later stage of the research data sources were re-checked carefully to ensure that findings and analysis of findings were consistent and reliable. This protected the study against threats of validity, and helped maintain a chain of evidence.

Inherent in this research was the impossibility of reaching findings free from bias. There is no entirely objective account of the historical events around the selection of MDG2. Versions of events varied between interviewees. Information available on websites was sometimes misleading. UN policy texts, although more reliable than websites, also contained inaccuracies. Yet as an historical study it was less prone to reactive effects (de Vaus 2001) and it was only the differences between accounts that needed exploration and analysis. These differences opened gaps and raised questions, leading to more nuanced findings. Therefore the bias inherent in this historical study, I propose, strengthened it. Also, at numerous points, I was left not knowing what the findings would be. This confirmed that I kept my bias in check by avoiding "choosing only that evidence that (was) consistent with (my) hunches and ignoring that which (was) counter to them" (Cohen et al 2007, p. 5).

Interviews also strengthened the study. Interviewee accounts gave rich insight into the process and allowed exploration of themes. Interviewees reflected on and critiqued the process, including their own role in it. They provided constructive alternatives for the SDGs. Accounts by three policy actors from the inner circle correlated with each other closely and confirmed what had already been found in the texts and via CDA.

Interviewees gave the overriding impression that they worked to address poverty yet also revealed sneaking of priorities, and conniving with the OECD. So there were mixed motivations. These initially appeared to be contradictions but at least led to deeper insights. Interviewees were generous and open with their responses.

Grounding each hypothesis in a theory also helped evaluation of those theories in relation to the study. As a researcher I was able to follow a pathway starting with theory, generating a hypothesis and indicators, gathering data, reaching findings, then evaluating the hypotheses, and finally coming back to implications for the theory. Of course this was not always followed in a lock step fashion. Nevertheless, the link from theory to findings and then back to theory made the pathway rigorous, clear and I hope also made the findings reliable and useful. In this way, the study was also a theory testing exercise.

However the use of three theories also introduced complementarities and tensions into the study. In some ways the theories have fundamentally different assumptions. Each theory brought different aspects of the process to light and the dialogue between the three frameworks strengthened findings. Each had different strengths and different aspects of the policy process that it did not explain well. Bringing the three theories into dialogue made the study more complex, yet more robust and made the findings more nuanced. Also, these different theories are in use in current research. So I propose that it was valuable to bring these various perspectives into dialogue in one study.

Likewise there were complementarities and tensions in the case study method. Initially a relatively unstructured qualitative inquiry was used to develop the research question. Once the research question was clarified a more structured method to answer it was designed. This design included hypotheses development, hypothesis testing, tracking

and quantitative analysis. Alongside these it also used more discursive and exploratory methods such as CDA, tracing of emerging themes, relationships mapping, mind mapping, recursive loops through data and findings, and gradual sharpening of findings through progressive iterations of the dissertation. These exploratory and discursive methods helped set conditions for hypothesis testing and contributed to findings. Whilst using different methods alongside each other introduced tensions, these tensions forced deeper reflection and recursive loops back through data to hypothesis and theory. The aim was to ensure that findings were justified by data and that findings made sense in relation to each other. It meant that findings were justified by looking for patterns and coherence, that is, by “consistency, simplicity, comprehensiveness, and explanatory unity” (Evers and Haig 2016, p. 65). Also the difference between qualitative and quantitative methods was not entirely clear. For example there were quantitative elements to analysis of the prevalence of themes in policy texts, as well as interpretative elements. Evers and Haig put forward that “quantitative research and qualitative research are not fundamentally different modes of inquiry” (p. ix). Rather, the use of different methods is a form of triangulation and a self-correcting procedure, enhancing validity. Therefore I propose that the use of different methods in this study, whilst complex, enhanced validity.

### **6.3 Weaknesses of this case study**

CDA was used extensively in the early stages of the study and provided a basis for understanding assumptions, themes, voices included and excluded and to disarticulate policy texts. It helped track priorities and shifting themes. It showed the growing prevalence of neo-liberal themes in dominant texts and showed who was behind those texts. However, because I was unexpectedly granted interviews with elite policy actors, in the latter part of the project, interview data was used more than CDA data. Once I recognised this I went back through CDA data in a recursive loop, yet the evidence of UN interviewees became more prominent in the latter stages of the study. CDA was useful in tracking general shifts in the policy process, but there was room for more substantial utilization of it.

Another weakness was the difficulty in containing the level of effort required to complete the study. There was seemingly no end to available data and no end to new

avenues of research. At a point, once data was consistent across various sources, I had to consciously move to analysis. Authors cited (such as de Vaus 2001, Gerring 2004 and Yin 2014) regard case study as remarkably difficult for that reason.

It was also difficult to avoid slippage into interesting aspects of the process that were not directly related to the research question. MDG2 was part of a selection process of 8 MDGs. So slippage into how and why other MDGs came to be selected was almost inevitable. This was further complicated by slippage into considering priorities that were excluded, as these were co-dependent. There were also tantalizing scoops. These scoops were suited more to investigative journalism than the formalities of the case study method and were excluded, yet they were a persistent distraction. The volume of information obtained made both limiting and editing the study increasingly difficult.

Inability to establish all of the reasons as to *how* and *why* MDG2 came to be selected, was a weakness, even if an unavoidable one. This is normal in relation to historical processes and social phenomenon. Establishing causal effect was not possible within the bounds of a single case study because the researcher “must examine several instances of this phenomena to gauge the average affect of X on Y and the random element of that variation” (Gerring 2004, p. 348). However, this study has made reasonable and convincing inferences that constitute convincing and reliable findings. Whilst there are difficulties in establishing causal effect, the case study put together “general knowledge of the world with empirical knowledge of how X and Y inter-relate” (Gerring 2004, p. 348).

There is also an unlikelihood that this study could be replicated and achieve the same result. The sequence of events and findings regarding *how* MDG2 came to be selected should be very similar. However, inherent in answering the *why* aspect of the question are the theoretical frameworks being used, the researcher’s interpretation of events, and policy actors’ interpretation of events. It is unlikely that any two independent studies using this method would reach identical findings regarding *why* MDG2 was selected. Taking the cancellation of foreign debt in deeply indebted developing countries as an example. There is no question that it was removed from the policy text. There is no question that this was done in a surreptitious way. Yet establishing *why* it



was done is open to the particular ontological assumptions of the researcher. Based on the same historical event one could argue that it was done to harm developing countries, or one could argue that it was done to benefit developing countries. The difficulty in this study of establishing the *why* of the research question might also be an inherent difficulty of social studies, politics and economics, which are not objective and unbiased sciences.

The study has not taken into account the views of developing countries beyond what was said at the General Assembly. Nor did it take into account the implementation of the policy in developing countries. This is a weakness. Just because policy actors selected universal primary education as a priority, it does not necessarily follow that all developing countries implemented it. As Apple (2006) states “There are always complex mediations at each level of the process” (p. 479). When the UN decides what the global community should do, it does not necessarily follow that the global community does it. A point made by Kofi Annan in his memoirs (2012). To that end, interviews with developing country policy actors would have strengthened findings. They would have helped explore the extent to which the policy met the practical needs and goals of developing countries. This weakness was compensated for by tracing the policy process carefully, to see who the dominant actors were and by using verbatim records of UN General Assembly sessions. Although a note of caution is required. There are inherent difficulties in establishing the extent to which a voice could represent a developing country. For example Annan’s memoirs were included in this study, but I have regarded his voice as that of an elite policy actor. Equally one could argue that he represents developing countries. A decision as to what voice represents developing countries is subject to researcher assumptions.

It was also difficult, at times, to give adequate attention to discussing education. In progressive iterations I had to consciously include more discussion of it. There was very little discussion of education in the various policy texts analysed, other written sources and interview data. Interviewees who were part of the MDG policy elite barely talked about education and had to be prompted by me to focus on it. Yet education comprised two of eight MDGs. This weakness in the policy process may be reflected in this study.

Finally, there were moralistic comments in previous iterations of this research inquiry. These have been systematically eliminated, but it is possible some remain, or are at least implied. As stated, policy actors interviewed were self critical and critical of aspects of the MDG process, in a constructive sense. In the year 2000, over 1 billion people lived on less than \$1.00 per day (Annan 2012). Today that number is estimated at 836 million (United Nations 2015c). The poverty that global development policies are addressing remains a serious moral and ethical issue, and those making decisions are at least partly responsible for the consequences of those decisions. If policy actors knowingly allowed certain priorities agreed to in the *Millennium Declaration* to be excluded and thereby perpetuated a status quo that is itself a root cause of poverty, then it is a serious matter. I hope that this study has done policy actors no injustice. Their actions are justifiably open to critique, for the purpose of transformation. As is this study.

## **6.4 Researcher positioning and three theories**

The interplay between the researcher's position, the three theories and case study method requires explanation. Three theories were used to reduce the effect of researcher bias, in particular a rational synoptic theory was used as a counter-point to critical and world society theories.

As was mentioned in the introduction, my position as a researcher lies between the global elite, elite policy actors and those that the MDGs claims to help. Of these groups, my experience, education and research assumptions probably position me closest to elite policy actors (although this is contestable). Elite policy actors work in the tension between the interests of the poor and the global elite. My position as a researcher also lies in this tension.

Tentative and contestable as it is, an aspect of my own particular position affected research outcomes. That was the tension between, on the one hand, the valuable contribution of the MDGs, understanding the situation of elite policy actors and ensuring they were treated with dignity and respect. Whilst on the other hand, understanding the extent to which the MDG policy process reinforced global structures that are correlated with and potentially exacerbate poverty in developing countries.

The tension between these aspects of the policy process persisted throughout the study, even to within days of submitting the dissertation. Yet the tension was a source of deepening reflection and was valuable. In the end, the needs of those that the policy was claiming to serve, I hope, took priority.

Awareness of the possibility of researcher bias affecting outcomes was one of the motivations for using three theories and for generating and testing three unique hypotheses. This was done to stretch and break the bonds of my own positioning and to force me to ask questions and see perspectives that I might not otherwise have seen. This proved a valuable exercise, even though making the study difficult to bring together at the end.

## **6.5 Policy process implications**

This is a single case study therefore it does not claim that the findings are applicable to policy processes generally. However, the SDG policy process is underway now. Given that the SDGs follow the MDGs, the findings can be applied to the SDG policy process. This section applies critical theory to generate alternatives.

This study showed that the 'economic side' heavily influenced the selection of MDG2. Luca raised concerns about this, saying that developing countries need to be in the driver's seat for the SDGs. Giancarlo criticised the parachuting of priorities into developing countries, and supported agencies working as a catalyst for development in developing countries. This is something to be critically examined in the SDG process, to ensure that developing countries are in the driver's seat and that agencies work in the local context, as a catalyst for development. If the World Bank and IMF intend to determine policy priorities then processes and discussions should be transparent.

Linked to the above, a reassessment of an uncritical acceptance of neo-liberalism as the dominant hegemony is vital for the development of the SDGs. Jolly, Emmerij and Weiss's (2009) account of the history of UN goal setting shows that between 1980 and 2000 developing countries that followed or were forced to follow the Washington consensus fared badly and in many cases went backwards. Over that 20-year period

in Sub-Saharan Africa debts soared and per capita income was actually minus 15%. Whilst “causal linkages have not yet been well understood... the association between adoption of a uniform model and the accumulation of problems of inequality and poverty is a cause for serious concern” (Jolly et al 2009, p. 91). It is also important to remember that the *Millennium Declaration* was not primarily a neo-liberal text. Many priorities included in the *Millennium Declaration* were excluded. The refined list of MDGs came later in the process. In the MDG policy process Kofi Annan, the UN Secretary General, clearly, openly and unapologetically engaged the private sector (Annan 2012). As such, he largely embraced the Washington consensus, or at least failed to stop it being the dominant economic and social hegemony in the MDG policy process. For Jolly et al (2009) “The income of the world’s poor has remained low even when national economies have been strong... The rising tide of globalization has certainly lifted a number of boats, but it has left millions struggling in the water and has drowned many of the world’s poorest” (p. 114). The question of distribution of wealth and equality should be “back at the centre of economic analysis” (Piketty 2014, p. 16). Therefore a neo-liberal economic paradigm should not be accepted uncritically as the dominant SDG policy paradigm. Rather its effects on economic growth, the distribution of wealth and poverty in developing countries must be researched, to see if causal links exist.

The role of development professionals is an important consideration in the SDG policy process also. Development professionals played a significant role in MDG selection. According to this study, they had substantially more influence than the UN General Assembly, well beyond their mandate. Even if they achieved better results than the *Millennium Declaration* might have, a crucial role in the selection of goals by development professionals should not be accepted as inevitable. If the UN is primarily a gathering of nation-states, then the General Assembly should be the highest authority. As Milligan (2011) states a “more varied sample of people at the policymaking table could dramatically shift the power relations and lead to a policy that has greater chance of successful implementation” (p. 284). There are indications that this is currently the case with the SDG process. Csaba Kőrösi, Permanent Representative of Hungary to the General Assembly, and Macharia Kamau, Permanent Representative of Kenya to the United Nations headed the group apparently managing the SDG selection process (UN General Assembly 2014).

Verification of this more broadly would require systematic research over a period of time, and that is beyond the bounds of this study.

At the same time this study has discussed the failure of educators to provide understandable, actionable, limited and effective global education policy priorities. McGrath (2010) asks “Do we need to make the case for education’s contribution to economic development more forcefully? (p. 250). We educators indeed need to make the case more forcefully, using research methods and language that ‘the economic side’ will understand and respect. So responsibility does not only lie with the economic side and powerful policy actors alone, but lies also with educators. Educators should not wait to be granted access to UN policy processes but need to influence those processes. Recently UNESCO at Incheon, Korea, held a World Education Forum for that purpose (UNESCO 2015). It is yet to be seen what its affect will be. Also SDG4 was designed and selected prior to that forum, and it is not yet clear who designed and selected it.

## **6.6 Conclusions and implications for education literature**

Vandemoortele (2011) and Annan (2012) published accounts contributing to the historical record of the MDG policy process. Yet in regards to education Unterhalter (2014) rightly states “As yet there is no historical account of the diplomatic and organizational processes that resulted in the narrowing of the EfA and Dakar agendas to the MDG framework on education” (p. 179). This study helps fill that gap in the literature, providing an historical account of the MDG policy process and of MDG2’s selection. Also, it would be in Annan’s interest to show the policy process in a positive light, whereas this study is not subject to those same interests.

Ilcan (2006) raises concerns about a lack of critical sociological attention in the literature regarding trans-national policy processes, such as the MDGs. King questions how the global education policy architecture was constructed and says that “the role of multilateral bodies in advancing this agenda has been little researched” (2007, p. 378). This study contributes to that literature and helps fill those gaps by critically examining the policy process and the role of multilateral bodies. It shows how various interest groups were privileged, how particular interests were served and others not (Ingram et

al 2007). The study also challenges and interrogates how power systems and inequality reproduced themselves in the policy process (Sarantakos 2005) and how the organisational context and policy history shaped outcomes (Adam & Kriesi 2007). Related to this, the study shows how developing country voices were not at the table of those determining the MDGs. This reinforces concerns raised by Escobar (2004), Ilcan (2006), King (2007), Pogge (2010) and Vandemoortele (2011).

Piketty (2014) considers the enormous disparity between the global rich and the global poor and asserts that for “too long economists have neglected the distribution of wealth” (2014, p. 16). Pogge (2010) considers the possibility that the poor have no friends among the global elite. Jolly et al (2009) discuss a correlation between developing countries following the Washington consensus (neo-liberal economics) and worsening poverty. This study shows a purposeful shift toward neo-liberal economics and gradual exclusion of more social democratic priorities. However, in relation to Pogge (2010), this study showed that elite UN policy actors did not consider themselves the global elite, rather some felt constrained by and subject to the global elite. Contribution to the literature following this study will need to consider this issue further. It should attempt to show who constituted the policy elite and who constituted the global elite in the MDG policy process, as they were not necessarily the same thing.

The study also shows the dominance of ‘the economic side’ in the MDG2 policy process. This confirms Ball’s observation of an “increasing colonisation of education policy by economic policy imperatives” (1998, p. 122). The dominance of the World Bank and IMF in the policy process, and absence of UNESCO confirms Mundy’s (1999) view that UNESCO has struggled to keep a humanistic vision of education in the midst of strong tendency toward functionalist and economic approaches.

This study also contributes to the literature regarding the role of development professionals and transnational organisations. Chabbott (2003) and Meyer et al (1997) assert that development professionals set agendas, establish priorities, and mandate actions independently “of both nation-states that funded them and their stated beneficiaries” (Chabbott p. 2). King (2007) makes similar observations regarding the World Bank and multilateral agencies in the EFA policy process. This study contributes

to that literature by showing that what Chabbott, Meyer and King assert was reflected in the MDG policy process also. Based on the results of this study, an alternative model, where developing countries have much more influence on policy outcomes, deserves further consideration. Although nuances and potential problems with this model are also recognised. We cannot reasonably assume that a nation-state representative at the UN represents the views of their constituency, or those living in poverty.

Emmerij et al (2005) and Jolly et al (2009) remind us of the successes of UN policy processes and UN goal setting generally. Annan (2012) and Vandemoortele (2011) remind us of the successes of the MDGs in particular. This study highlights the value of establishing a limited number of goals that are widely understood, actionable, “short and punchy enough to be effective” and within a framework “that would appeal to people” (Hayley). Therefore this study contributes to sociology literature regarding the SDGs as they appear to be broader and less ‘punchy’ than the MDGs. Also the study contributes to education literature regarding SDG4. In contrast to a ‘short and punchy’ MDG2, SDG4 is broad, comprehensive and similar to EFA. This raises the possibility that it may suffer the same fate as EFA (as discussed by interviewee ‘Max’) and other agreements of the 1990’s, many of which, according to Annan (2012), fell well short of targets. Although a contribution to the literature on this will require more systematic analysis of the SDG process.

## **6.7 Further research called for**

As was discussed in Section 5.5, this study was not designed as a theory building exercise. Yet the breadth of the case, rich data and findings lend themselves to a unique explanation of MDG2’s selection. Based on that unique explanation, a new theory could also be built, relevant to this case study.

It would also be interesting to explore this research question using complexity theory. Complexity theory views reality as organic, non-linear and holistic. “The key terms are feedback, recursion, emergence, connectedness and self organization, emergence over time through feedback and relationships of the internal and external environments, and survival through adaption and change” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 33). It

highlights “multiple causality and multidirectional causes and effects” (Cohen et al 2007, p. 34) as opposed to linear cause and effect chains. The policy process is explored as “an intervention in a tangled web of institutions that have developed incrementally over extended periods of time... This history shapes the constraints and the opportunities within which policy interventions can then unfold” (Room 2011, p. 7). According to Room the policy landscape is “being continuously transformed, as a result of these policy interventions and the efforts of a wider array of actors to anticipate and re-shape the policy terrain” (Room 2011, p. 7). In selecting MDG2, policy actors were working within a policy terrain and were part of a connective geometry wherein individual actors navigated by reference “to the movements of... immediate neighbours” (Room 2011, p. 24). This would potentially give a different perspective on the involvement of the UN General Assembly, Secretariat, World Bank, IMF, OECD, UNDP and so on. Examining them as policy actors affecting each other, rather than as a struggle for dominance by individuals or organisations with pre-conceived agendas. Over time these actors would establish inter-dependent relationships and pathways. Also, Room’s idea of the effect of the parameters of the system on policy actors, and the effect of policy actors back on to the parameters of the system, might provide some very interesting insights. Through this we might see the MDGs as being selected because of the parameters of the system, and at the same time the MDGs would have affected and changed those parameters. This may be evident now in the SDG policy process, with the remarkable acceptance of the need to establish global development goals for 2015-2030.

Using the same case study method for the SDG policy process would be useful. It would create an historical record of the process and provide a basis for comparison with the MDG process. The General Assembly agreements in the Sustainable Development Summit of 2015 may not constitute the policy in its final form. Tracking the decision makers and noting inclusions and exclusions will increase understanding of the forces behind shaping the dominant policy hegemony.

Finally, it would also be useful to apply the same research method to other UN policy processes. In this way more general findings could be reached regarding UN policy processes and regarding development professionals, elite policy actors the UN and



related organisations. Bringing the results of various studies together would help identify what policy paradigms were brought to the foreground at various times.

## **6.8 Final remarks**

Universal primary education was selected with a remarkable consensus among elite policy actors. This study found no evidence that education specialists were amongst those who selected MDG2 (and MDG3) and there was almost no discussion of education as a priority by those determining the MDGs. Rather, there was an un-reflexive acceptance of a goal that had regularly been a UN priority since 1948, a World Bank priority, and included in key policy texts prior to the Millennium Summit.

For years developing countries had complained about the short-sightedness of prioritising primary over secondary and tertiary education (Klees 2008). Prior to the selection of MDG2, a task force commissioned by UNESCO and the World Bank showed that the rate of return analysis on primary education was flawed. Yet the ‘economic side’, including the World Bank leadership, played a crucial role in influencing MDG2’s selection. Their influence contributed to the gradual and subtle erosion of priorities aiming to help developing countries compete on world markets. This means that a policy architecture was established to combat poverty, which in itself may be a cause of poverty. This trend was difficult to address because of its subtle nature and uncertainty as to *how* and *why* decisions were being made.

However this study did not find that “The poor have no friends among the global elite” (Pogge 2010, p. 62). Rather, some elite policy actors are genuinely trying to address poverty and have devoted their professional lives to this. They were working in an exceptionally complex and multi-layered policy environment. In some ways policy actors are themselves subject to the policy process and trajectory of policy priorities.

An important area for further research is highlighted by Jolly et al (2009), who identified a correlation between alignment with the Washington consensus and slowed or even negative growth in developing countries. If research can establish that alignment with the Washington consensus is a cause of poverty in developing

countries then this is a serious issue in relation to the MDGs. It is also a serious issue for development in general.

Another interesting realization coming from this research was that exploring the policy process is not as out of reach as one might assume. Policy actors were making decisions, or not making decisions, on the spot, in the moment, in the pressures and complexity of the policy process. Policy actors displayed a deep commitment to addressing poverty. These same policy actors were subject to critical constituencies, to public opinion and to scrutiny. Such policy processes should be brought into the light, in order to generate constructive policy alternatives. This takes vigilant, systematic, time consuming and even controversial work. It takes looking for small clues in a sea of communication designed to form and sway public opinion. This case study has shown that it is possible to get below the surface, to follow the chain of evidence and to surface patterns of decision-making that show convincingly which priorities dominated and which groups ensured that they did. Such research puts justified pressure and accountability on policy actors.

Finally this research found that policy actors feared the *Millennium Declaration* was too broad to achieve. They regarded the strategy of selecting limited, achievable and measurable goals as successful. This gives an indication that SDG policy actors will do well to follow that model. Even though the General Assembly has now agreed on the SDGs, it is possible that the SDGs could change. Or even if they stay the same, a narrower subset could dominate between now and 2030. Given that policies have effects the fundamental challenge is emphasising both the right priorities and the right combination of priorities. After all, there is a lot at stake.

# Bibliography

Adam, S. and Kriesi, H., 2007. The Network Approach. In: P. Sabatier. *Theories of the policy process*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 129-154.

Annan, K. 2000. *We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: United Nations.

Annan, K. 2012. *Interventions: a life in war and peace*. London: Allen Lane.

Apple, M., 2006. Producing inequalities neo-liberalism neo-conservatism and the politics of educational reform. In: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough and A. Halsey, eds. *Education, globalization and social change*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 468-489.

Ball, S., 1993. What is Policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *Discourse studies in the cultural politics of education*, 13(2), pp. 10-17.

Ball, S., 1994. *Education reform: a critical and post structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Ball, S., 1998. Big Policies/Small World: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34(2).

Bergeron, S., 2008. Shape shifting neo-liberalism and World Bank education policy. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6(4), pp. 349-353.

Bhaskar, R. and Callinicos, A., 2003. Marxism and Critical Realism: A Debate. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 1(2), pp. 89-114.

Bourdieu, P., 2006. The forms of capital. In: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough and A. Halsey, eds. *Education, globalization and social change*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 105-119.

Buchanan, J., 1988. *The political economy of the welfare state*. Stockholm: The Industrial Institute for Economic and Social Research.

Burgess, R., 1982. *Field research: a sourcebook and field manual*. London: Unwin Hyman.

British Educational Research Association, 2011. Ethical guidelines for educational research [online]. Available from: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2011> [Accessed 23 December 2012].

Chabbott, C., 2003. *Constructing education for development: International organisations and education for all*. Routledge: New York.

Codd, J., 1988. The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents. *Journal of education policy*, 3(3), pp. 235-247.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K., 2007. *Research methods in education*. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. London: Routledge.

Dale, R., 2000. Globalization and education: Demonstrating a “common world educational culture” or locating a “globally structured educational agenda?” *Educational Theory*, 54 (4), pp. 427-448.

de Vaus, D., 2001. *Research design in social research*. London: Sage.

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W., 1983. The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48 (2), pp. 147-160.

Diplomacy Belgium, 2015. *Bio Data: Jan Vandemoortele* [Online]. Available from: [http://diplomatie.belgium.be/fr/binaries/res\\_vandemoortele\\_tcm313-99273.pdf](http://diplomatie.belgium.be/fr/binaries/res_vandemoortele_tcm313-99273.pdf) [Accessed 10 July 2015].

Drazen, A., 2006. Conditionality and ownership in IMF lending: a political economy approach. In: G. Ranis, J. Vreeland, S. Kosack eds. *Globalization and the nation-state: The impact of the IMF and the World Bank*. New York: Routledge, pp. 51-81.

Elster, J., 1994. Rationality, emotions, and social norms. *Synthese*, 98(1), pp. 21-49.

Emmerij, L., Jolly, R., and Weiss, G., 2005. Economic and social thinking at the UN in historical perspective. *Development and Change*, 36(2), pp. 211-235.

Escobar, A., 2004. Beyond the third world: imperial globality, global coloniality and anti-globalisation social movements. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(1) pp. 207-230.

Fairclough, N., 2003. *Analysing discourse: textual analysis of social research*. London: Routledge.

Gerring, J., 2004. What is a case study and what is it good for? *American Political Science Review*, 98(2), pp. 341-354.

Given, L., 2008. The Sage encyclopedia of research methods: data saturation [online]. Available from: <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/sage-encyc-qualitative-research-methods/n99.xml> [Accessed 6 August 2015].

Gordon, T. and Glen, J., 1994. An introduction to the Millennium Project. *Technological forecasting and social change*, 47(2), pp. 147-170.

Gough, N., 2002. Blank spots, blind spots, and methodological questions in postgraduate research. *Postgraduate Research Conference*, 4-6 October 2002, Deakin University, Australia.

Haig, B., 2005. Exploratory factor analysis, theory generation and scientific method. *Multivariate behavioural research*, 40(3), pp. 303-329.

Haig, B., and Evers, C., 2016. *Realist inquiry in social science*. London, Sage.

Hall, P., 1993. Policy paradigms, social learning, and the state: the case of economic policymaking in Britain. *Comparative politics*, 25(3), pp. 275-296.

Held, D., 2004. *Global Covenant: The social democratic alternative to the Washington Consensus*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heidenheimer, A., 1982. Education and social security entitlements in Europe and America. In Flora, P., Heidenheimer, A., 1982. *The development of welfare states in Europe and America*. New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Hill, M., 1997. *The policy process in the modern state*. London: Prentice Hall.

Ilcan, S. 2006. Global governing organisations: order building and waste management. *Current Sociology*, 54, pp. 851-872.

Ilcan, S. and Phillips, L. 2010. Developmentalities and calculative practices: the millennium development goals. *Antipode*, 42(4), pp. 844-874.

International Monetary Fund, 2015. *About the IMF* [online]. Available from: <http://www.imf.org/external/about.htm> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

International Monetary Fund, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, The United Nations, The World Bank Group, 2000. *A better world for all: progress toward the International Development Goals*. Paris.

Ingram, H., Schneider, A.L. and deLeon, P., 2007. Social Construction and Policy Design. In: P. Sabatier. *Theories of the policy process*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 93-126.

Jaeger, H., 2008. 'World opinion' and the founding of the UN: governmentalizing international politics. *European journal of international relations*, 14(4), pp. 589-618.

Jolly, R., Emmerij, L. and Weiss, T., 2009. *UN ideas that changed the world*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Jones, P., 2007. Global governance, social policy and multilateral education. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), pp. 321-323.

Kennedy School of Government, 2014. *John Ruggie: Professor of International Affairs* [online]. Available from: <http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/m-rcbg/johnruggie/index.html> [Accessed 22 December 2014].

Kincheloe J. L. and McLaren, P., 2000. Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln, eds. *Handbook of qualitative research*. California: Sage, pp. 279-313.

King, K., 2007. Multilateral agencies in the construction of the global agenda on education. *Comparative Education*, 43(3), pp. 377-391.

Klees, S., 2008. A quarter century of neoliberal thinking in education: misleading analysis and failed policies. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 6(4), pp. 311-348.

Kosack, S., 2012. *The education of nations: How the political organization of the poor, not democracy, led governments to invest in mass education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Luke, A., 1996. Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education*, 21, pp. 1-48.

Lukes, S., 2005. *Power: A Radical View*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

McGrath, S., 2010. The role of education in development: an educationalist's response to some recent work in development economics. *Comparative Education*, 46(2), pp. 237-253.

Meyer, J.W., Boli, J. and Thomas, G.M., 1987. Ontology, rationalization in the Western cultural account. In G. M. Thomas, J. W. Meyer, F. O. Ramirez, J. Boli eds. *Institutional structure: constituting state, society and the individual*. California: Sage, pp. 41-70.

Meyer, J.W., Boli, J., Thomas, G.M. and Ramirez, F.O., 1997. World Society and the Nation-State. *American Journal of Sociology*, 103(1), pp. 144-181.

Milligan, L., 2011. Global influences in educational policymaking: Free Secondary Education in Kenya. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 16 (3), pp. 275-287.

Moutsios, S., 2009. International organisations and transnational educational policy. *Compare: A journal of comparative and international education*, 39(4), pp. 469-481.

Mundy, K., 1999. Educational multilateralism in a changing world order: UNESCO and the limits of the possible. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 19(1), pp. 27-52.

Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals, 2014. *Open Working Group proposal for Sustainable Development Goals* [online]. Available from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/1579SDGs%20Proposal.pdf> [Accessed 7 June 2015).

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development: Development Assistance Committee, 1996. *Shaping the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: the contribution of development cooperation*. Paris: OECD.



Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2015. *OECD Members and Partners* [online]. Available from: <http://www.oecd.org/about/membersandpartners/> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

Ostrom, E., 1998. A Behavioral Approach to the Rational Choice Theory of Collective Action: Presidential Address, American Political Science Association, 1997. *The American Political Science Review*, 92(1), pp. 1-22.

Ostrom, E., 2007. Rational synoptic: an assessment of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework. In P. Sabatier. *Theories of the policy process*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Colorado: Westview Press, pp. 21-64.

Paris 21, 2015. *Paris 21: Partnership in Statistics for Development in the 21st Century* [Online]. Available from: [http://paris21.org/better\\_world-for-all](http://paris21.org/better_world-for-all) [Accessed 29 March 2015].

Pierson, P., 2000. Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 94(2), pp. 251-267.

Piketty, T., 2014. *Capital in the twenty-first century*. London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Pogge, T., 2010. *Politics as usual: what lies behind the pro-poor rhetoric*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Psacharopoulos, G., 2006. World Bank policy on education: a personal account. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26, pp. 329-338.

Raiser, K., 2000. A letter by Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser (Chair, World Council of Churches) to Secretary General Kofi Annan [Online]. Available from: <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/724.html>. [Accessed 19 October 2014].

Richards, L., 2005. *Handling qualitative data: a practical guide*. London: Sage Publications.

Rizvi, F. & Lingard, B. 2006. Globalization and the changing natures of the OECD's educational work. In: H. Lauder, P. Brown, J. Dillabough and A. Halsey, eds. *Education, globalization and social change*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 247-260.

Room, G., 2011. *Complexity, institutions and public policy: Agile decision making in a turbulent world*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

RORG network, 2004. *International Development Goals: from OECDs strategy "Shaping the 21st Century" (1996) to the UN Millennium Development Goals (2000/2)* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/729.html> [Accessed 7 October 2014].

Sabatier, P., 2007. *Theories of the policy process*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Colorado: Westview Press.

Samoff, J., 1999. Institutionalizing International Influence. In: R. Arnoe and C. Alberto Torres eds. *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 51-89.

Sarantakos, S., 2005. *Varieties of social research*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schäfer, A., 2006. A new form of governance? Comparing the open method of coordination to multilateral surveillance by the IMF and the OECD. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(1), pp. 70-88.

Scott, D., 2005. Critical Realism and Empirical Research Methods in Education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 39(4), pp. 633-646.

Souto-Otero, M., Fleckenstein, T., and Dacombe, R., 2008. Filling in the Gaps: European Governance, the Open Method of Coordination and the European Commission. *Journal of Education Policy*, 23(3), pp. 231-249.

Souto-Otero, M., 2013. Is 'better regulation' possible? Formal and substantive quality in the impact assessments in education and culture of the European Commission. *Evidence and Policy*, 9 (4), pp. 513-529.

Task Force on Higher Education and Society, 2000. *Higher Education and Developing Countries: Peril and Promise* [online]. Available from: <http://www.tfhe.net> [Accessed 4 October 2015].

Thakur, R. and Weiss, T., 2009. United Nations “Policy”: An Argument with Three Illustrations. *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(1), pp. 18–35.

United Nations, 1948. *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> [Accessed 22 December 2014].

United Nations, 1961. *United Nations Development Decade (A/RES/1710 (XVI))* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/observances/international-decades/> [Accessed 22 December 2014].

United Nations, 1970. *Second United Nations Development Decade (A/RES/2626(XXV))* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/observances/international-decades/> [Accessed 22 December 2014].

United Nations, 1995. *World Summit For Social Development, Copenhagen, 1995* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/wssd/text-version/> [Accessed 21 December 2014].

United Nations, 1997. *Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform A/RES/52/12* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/ga/documents/gares52/res5212.htm> [Accessed 18 June 2012].

United Nations, 1998. Yearbook of the United Nations 1998, Volume 52 [Online]. Available from:

<http://www.unmultimedia.org/searchers/yearbook/page.jsp?volume=1998&page=1>  
[Accessed 23 December 2013].

United Nations, 2000. *United Nations Millennium Declaration A/RES/55/2* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm> [Accessed 3 November 2010].

United Nations, 2008. *High level event on the Millennium Development Goals. Committing to action: achieving the Millennium Development Goals* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/2008highlevel/pdf/committing.pdf> [Accessed 7 March 2011].

United Nations, 2011a. *United Nations: About the UN* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/structure/index.shtml> [Accessed 7 March 2011].

United Nations 2011b. *General Assembly of the United Nations: Subsidiary Organs of the General Assembly* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/ga/about/subsidiary/committees.shtml> [Accessed 9 March 2011].

United Nations, 2012. *Millennium Development Goals* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml> [Accessed 18 June 2012].

United Nations, 2014. *The Millennium Development Goals Report 2014*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations, 2014a. *UN Conferences, Meetings and Events: Millennium Summit (6-8 September 2000)* [Online]. Available from: [http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/millennium\\_summit.shtml](http://www.un.org/en/events/pastevents/millennium_summit.shtml) [Accessed 22 December 2014]

United Nations, 2014b. *We Can End Poverty: Millennium Development Goals and Beyond* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/bkgd.shtml> [Accessed 4 November 2014].

United Nations, 2015. *Sustainable Development Goals* [Online]. Available from: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/topics/sustainabledevelopmentgoals> [Accessed 2 May 2015].

United Nations, 2015a. *United Nations: About the UN* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/about-un/> [Accessed 20 May 2015].

United Nations, 2015b. *United Nations: Overview* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/overview/index.html> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

United Nations, 2015c. *The Millennium Development Goals Report* [Online]. Available from: <http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Resources/Static/Products/Progress2015/English2015.pdf> [Accessed 12 July 2015].

United Nations Children's Fund, 2015. *UNICEF: Who we are* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unicef.org/about/> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs- Economic and Social Council, 2014. *24th special session of the United Nations General Assembly Geneva 26 June - 1 July 2000* [Online]. Available from: <http://undesadspd.org/Home/Geneva2000.aspx> [Accessed 11 October 2014].

United Nations Development Programme, 2015. *Our work: overview* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/overview.html> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 1960. *Convention against Discrimination in Education, Eleventh session, 14 December 1960, Paris* [Online]. Available from: [http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL\\_ID=12949&URL\\_DO=DO\\_TOPIC&URL\\_SECTION=201.html](http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=12949&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html) [Accessed 21 December 2014].

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2000. *World Education Forum, 2000. The Conference: World Education for All* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/education/wef/en-conf/Jomtien%20Declaration%20eng.shtm> [Accessed 22 December 2014].

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2007. *UNESCO: Operational definition of basic education* [online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/education/framework.pdf> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation, 2013. *Education for all goals* [online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/efa-goals/> [Accessed 26 December 2013].

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2014. *Education for All Movement* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/> [Accessed 21 December 2014].

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2015. *UNESCO 'What's new?'* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Pages/default.aspx?SPSLanguage=EN> [Accessed 24 May 2015].

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2015a. *Introducing UNESCO* [Online]. Available from: <http://en.unesco.org/about-us/introducing-unesco> [Accessed 10 July 2015].

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural and Scientific Organization, 2015b. *UNESCO: Fast Track Initiative* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/education/themes/leading-the-international-agenda/education-for-all/funding/fast-track-initiative> [Accessed 24 October 2015].

United Nations General Assembly, 1948. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Paris: United Nations [online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/> [Accessed 18 July 2012].

United Nations General Assembly, 1970. *International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (A/RES/25/2626), Twenty-fifth session, 24 October 1970* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un-documents.net/a25r2626.htm> [Accessed 21 December 2014].

United Nations General Assembly, 1997. *Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform (A/RES/52/12 A, A/RES/52/12 B)* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/esa/documents/ares52.htm> [Accessed 8 July 2012].

United Nations General Assembly, 2001. *58<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting, Fifty-sixth session, 19 November 2001* [online]. Available from: <http://undocs.org/A/56/PV.58> [Accessed 29 December 2014].

United Nations General Assembly, 2001a. *59<sup>th</sup> plenary meeting, Fifty-sixth session, 19 November 2001* [online]. Available from: <http://undocs.org/A/56/PV.59> [Accessed 29 December 2014].

United Nations General Assembly, 2005. *2005 World Summit Outcome, Sixtieth session, 16 September 2005 (A/60/L.1)*. New York: United Nations [Online]. Available from: <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/ods/A-RES-60-1-E.pdf> [Accessed 24 December 2013].

United Nations General Assembly, 2010. *Keeping the promise: united to achieve the Millennium Development Goals, A/RES/65/1* [Online]. Available from: [http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/outcome\\_documentN1051260.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/mdg/summit2010/pdf/outcome_documentN1051260.pdf) [Accessed 28 December 2013].

United Nations General Assembly, 2014. *Report of the Open Working Group of the General Assembly on Sustainable Development Goals (A/68/970)*. New York: United Nations [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/FIELD/Santiago/pdf/Open->

Working-Group.pdf [Accessed 7 June 2015].

United Nations Millennium Project, 2005. *Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals*. New York: UN Millennium Project.

United Nations Millennium Project, 2014. *UN Millennium Project* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unmillenniumproject.org> [Accessed 24 December 2014].

United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service, 2007. *Intergovernmental Negotiations and Decision Making at the United Nations: A Guide*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. New York and Geneva: United Nations.

United Nations Secretary General, 2000. *We the peoples: The role of the United Nations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Secretary General, 2001. *Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration (A/56/326)*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Secretary General, 2005. *In Larger Freedom: toward security, development and human rights for all (A/59/2005)*. New York: United Nations.

United Nations Secretary General, 2014. *The road to dignity by 2030: ending poverty, transforming all lives and protecting the planet (A/69/700)*. New York: United Nations.

Unterhalter, E., 2014. Measuring Education for the Millennium Development Goals: Reflections on Targets, Indicators, and a Post-2015 Framework. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 15(2-3), pp. 176-187.

Vandemoortele, J., 2011. The MDG story: intention denied. *Development & Change*, 42(1), pp. 1-21.

Van Evera, S., 1997. *Guide to methods for students of political science*. London: Cornell University Press.



Vidovich, L., 2007. Removing policy from its pedestal: some theoretical framings and practical possibilities. *Educational review* 59(3), pp. 285-298.

Walford, G., 1994. *Researching the powerful in education*. London: UCL Press.

Walford, G., 2009. The practice of writing ethnographic field notes. *Ethnography and Education*, 4(2), pp. 117-130.

World Bank, 2014. *Data: Millennium Development Goals* [Online]. Available from: <http://data.worldbank.org/about/millennium-development-goals> [Accessed 2 September 2014].

World Bank, 2015. *The World Bank* [online]. Available from: <http://www.worldbank.org> [Accessed 3 August 2015].

World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien, Thailand, 1990. *World Declaration on Education for All: Meeting Basic Learning Needs* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.unesco.org/education/wef/en-conf/Jomtien%20Declaration%20eng.shtm> [Accessed 19 June 2013].

World Education Forum, Dakar, Senegal, 2000. *The Dakar Framework for Action, Education for All: Meeting our Collective Commitments*. Dakar, World Education Forum [Online]. Available from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001211/121147e.pdf> [Accessed 7 February 2015].

World Trade Organisation, 2015. *What is the WTO?* [Online]. Available from: [https://www.wto.org/english/thewto\\_e/whatis\\_e/whatis\\_e.htm](https://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm) [Accessed 10 July 2015].

Yin, R., 1989. Case study research: Design and methods. *Applied Social Research Series*, Vol. 5. London: Sage.

Yin, R., 2014. *Case study research: design and methods*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. California: Sage.

# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Critical discourse analysis

The following table contains questions used for policy text and discourse analysis. Most are taken directly from Fairclough (2003 pp. 191-194). Questions generated by me, are based on the literature in Chapter 2 of this research inquiry and are marked with an '\*'.

	Millennium Declaration	Road Map	Annex	Investing in Development	World Summit
Title*	United Nations Millennium Declaration. A /RES/55/2.	Road Map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration. A/56/326	Annex-Millennium Development Goals. Road Map A/56/326.	Investing in Development: A Practical Plan to Achieve the Millennium Development Goals.	2005 World Summit Outcome. A/RES/60/1
Year of publication*	2000	2001	2001	2005 (January)	2005 (October)
Author(s) as identified in the text*	UN General Assembly	UN Secretary General	UN Secretary General	Co-authored by UN Secretariat and UN Millennium Project task force coordinators: Agnes Binagwaho, Nancy Birdsall, Jaap Broekmans, Mushtaque Chowdhury, Pietro Garau, Geeta Rao Gupta, Amina J. Ibrahim, Calestous Juma, Yolanda Kakabadse Navarro, Lee Yee-Cheong, Roberto Lenton, Jeff McNeely, Don J. Melnick, Patrick Messerlin, Paula Munderi, Mari	UN General Assembly

				Pangestu, Allan Rosenfield, Josh Ruxin, Pedro Sanchez, Elliot D. Sclar, Burton Singer, M. S. Swaminathan, Awash Teklehaimanot , Albert Wright, Ernesto Zedillo.	
Genre (overarching- not sub-genres)*	Declaration	Report	Report	Report	Resolution
Word count*	4,500 (estimate)	25,000 (estimate)	1,150 (estimate)	120,000 (estimate)	19,000 (estimate)
Contributors as listed in the document*		Heads of State and Govt. via Millennium Declaration, UN system, Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization, inter- governmental organizations, international organizations, regional organizations, civil society.	UN Secretariat, IMF, OECD, World Bank.	Project Director: Jeffrey Sachs.  Task force coordinators (as above)  250 task force members/ experts from around the world including: scientists, development practitioners, parliamentaria ns, policymakers, representative s of civil society, UN Agencies, the World Bank, The IMF, the Private sector.  UN Secretariat  UN Development Programme Administrator- Mark Malloch Brown in capacity as chair of UN Development Group.	

<b>Social Events (Fairclough Ch. 2)</b>					
What social event, and what chain of social events, is the text part of?	Refers to ongoing efforts to establish just and lasting peace in accordance with UN Charter.	Follows Millennium Declaration. Focus on implementation strategies.	Main reference document was section III of the Millennium Declaration.	UN Millennium Project, following the Millennium Declarations, Road Map and Road Map Annex.	Refers to Millennium Summit and Millennium Declaration.
What social practice or network of social practices can the events be referred to, be seen as framed within?	UN as common house for human family-protector and perpetrator of human rights.	UN as common house for human family-protector and perpetrator of human rights. UN and global agreements.	Development assistance and UN as common house for human family-protector and perpetrator of human rights.	Development assistance, interconnected solutions, agencies and national governments as responsible for development.	Millennium Declaration and internationally agreed development goals. But document clearly specifies internationally agreed goals including MDGs so follows Millennium Declaration, Road Map, but not Annex and Practical Plan.
Is the text part of a chain or network of texts?	UN resolutions, declarations, agreements, protocols. UN Charter. UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.	Millennium Declaration.	Millennium Declaration, UN Road Map.	Claims "Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Millennium Declaration" (p. 1). But also follows UN Road Map, UN Road Map Annex.	UN Millennium Summit and Declaration, UN resolutions, declarations, agreements, protocols. UN Charter. UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
<b>Genre (Fairclough Ch. 2, 4)</b>					
Is the text situated within a genre chain?	UN agreements (esp. 1990's). UN Resolution as the 'norm' for General Assembly outcomes.	UN agreements (esp. 1990's and General Assembly resolutions). Outcomes of UN conferences and global agreements, international laws and norms. Situates text	Millennium Declaration and Road Map.	Millennium Declaration, Road Map and Road Map Annex.	Millennium Declaration and Road Map.

		within context of “more than 500 multilateral instruments” of which the Secretary General is the depository (Road Map, p. 8)			
Is the text characterized by a mix of genres?	No	Yes.  It is a report to the General Assembly on a topic specified by the General Assembly, but it is also imploring governments and organizations to act.	No.  It is a proposal within a report. Essentially a clear articulation of goals, targets and indicators.	Yes.  It is a report to the Secretary General. Also a justification and plan to the global community for achieving the MDGs.	No
What genres does the text draw upon, and what are their characteristics (in terms of Activity, Social Relations, Communication Technologies)?	Resolution/ Declaration.	Draws on: *resolutions- which are both binding and non-binding agreements- detailed texts with a series of proposed or agreed actions. *international agreements, laws and norms- that may be specific or general in nature depending on agreement (e.g. Kyoto specific) *humanitarian documents such as the UN Charter of Human Rights, encouraging members of the human family to take responsibility for fellow human beings.	Goals, targets and indicators. Clear, stable numerical targets. Draws on rational synoptic theory. Refers mainly to Section III of Millennium Declaration- but introduction also refers to UN conferences and agreements of 1990's, as well as UN resolutions.	Justification for addressing global issues, as well as practical means, including numerical targets. Refers mainly to Road Map Annex. Different chapters are produced by different working groups and have different priorities. For example chapter 3 is strongly neo-liberal and free market economics influenced, yet chapter 1 is more based in critical theory and attempts to unmask injustice.	Resolution. Although also is critical of Secretariat, so in part corrects detour in Annex and Practical Plan (Sachs)
<b>Difference (Fairclough Ch. 3)</b>					
Which combination of the following scenarios characterize the orientation of the text?	b) Accentuation of difference in regards to rich (those who have the means and	b) Accentuation of difference in regards to rich (those who have the means and power to effect change) and poor	d) A bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity.	d) A bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity.	d) Bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity in reference to

<p>a. An openness to, acceptance of, recognition of difference; an exploration of difference, as in 'dialogue' in the richest sense of the term</p> <p>b. An accentuation of difference, conflict, polemic, a struggle over meaning, norms, power</p> <p>c. An attempt to resolve or overcome difference</p> <p>d. A bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity</p> <p>e. Consensus, a normalization and acceptance of differences of power which brackets or suppresses differences of meaning over norms</p>	<p>power to effect change) and poor (those who have neither the means nor power to affect their situation and are therefore subject to change organised by others)</p> <p>d) Bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity in reference to human family uniting to solve problems.</p>	<p>(those who have neither the means nor power to affect their situation and are therefore subject to change organised by others)</p> <p>d) Bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity in reference to human family uniting to solve problems.</p>			<p>human family uniting to solve problems.</p>
<p><b>Inter-textuality (Fairclough Ch. 3)</b></p>					
<p>Of relevant other texts/voices, which are included, which are significantly excluded?</p>	<p>Included: Is voice of 'We' referring to General Assembly. There is also a 'we' within the "We", because of preferential bias toward democratic governance.</p> <p>Excluded: The voices of those that the policy is</p>	<p>Included: Secretary General's voice, but has various functions that don't seem to obviously go together. His voice functions as: 1. Person proposing a framework for action to UN (Gov't rep's in particular), 2. Voice appealing to broader</p>	<p>Included: Secretary General's voice is included, has clear function- to propose millennium development goals, including a comprehensive set of indicators. UN Secretariat, IMF, OECD,</p>	<p>Included: Voice of Millennium Declaration and moral authority of UN Declaration of Human Rights. Voice of Task forces and contributors to task forces. Voice of those speaking on behalf of the poor.</p> <p>Excluded:</p>	<p>Included: Is voice of 'We' referring to General Assembly, although there is a 'we' within the "We", because of preferential bias toward democratic and good governance.</p> <p>Excluded: Secretary</p>

	attempting to help (poor, suffering, women, refugees, children).	community including various UN and related organisations on behalf of civil society and its governance groups 3. Voice of moral authority on behalf of the poor 4. Promoter of agreed human rights principles of the human community 5. Promoter of UN employees/agencies  Excluded: 1. Those that the Millennium Declaration is claiming to help (the poor) 2. Governments 3. NGOs- although behind the scenes influence is unclear.	World Bank.  Excluded: 1. Those that the Millennium Declaration is claiming to help 2. Governments 3. NGOs	Those that the Millennium Declaration is claiming to help (the poor) 2. Governments 3. NGOs	General's voice. The voices of those that the policy is attempting to help (poor, suffering, women, refugees, children). IMF, World Bank, NGOs.
Where other voices are included? Are they attributed, and if so, specifically or non-specifically?	Possibly non-specific inclusion of special needs of Africa and small island states.	The voice of the international community – especially moral weight of voice of collective international community and civil society, via international agreements.	No other voices are included. Although implicit reference to UN Secretariat, IMF, OECD, World Bank, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UNDP, UN Development Group (including WHO, UNCTAD), UN departments, funds, agencies, programmes, regional	The voices of the task forces come through clearly, although it is not specified who is the author of each particular chapter. Yet voices critical of the 8 MDGs as outlined in the Annex come through. For example under education much emphasis is put on secondary and tertiary education, even though it is not one of	Voice of Nation State representatives speaking as General Assembly is clear. Those criticising the Secretariat are prominent. Document is quite consistent throughout and appears to be cohesive.



			groups and experts.	the goals.	
Are attributed voices directly reported (quoted), or indirectly reported?	Voice is direct "We" of the General Assembly.	Voices of previous agreements.	No attributed voices.	No attributed voices.	Voice is direct "We" of the General Assembly.
How are other voices textured in relation to the authorial voice, and in relation to each other?	n/a	Voices of agreements of international community. Agreements are presented as unanimous and clear. Also despite large number of agreements references to them imply a coherent body of international policy, made by a coherent body of policy actors, carrying the weight of world opinion.	n/a	n/a	n/a
* Are other voices used to reinforce the social purpose of the text?	n/a	Yes, the other voices, such as UN and other agreements and international governance bodies, are used as the justification for the policy text.	n/a	n/a	n/a
<b>Assumptions (Fairclough Ch. 3)</b>					
What existential, propositional, or value assumptions are made?	Existential: Poverty exists. Human community increasingly interconnected and interdependent.  Propositional: By coordinated action and commitment we can combat poverty  Value: Societies and	Existential: Poverty exists. Human community increasingly interconnected and interdependent. UN is effective means of addressing poverty. UN decisions are morally correct and binding.  Propositional: By coordinated action and commitment we can combat poverty. More	Propositional : Goals and targets should be limited in number, clear, stable, numerical, actionable, measurable, monitored and reported on. By coordinated action and commitment we can combat poverty.  Value: Clear,	Existential: Poverty exists. Human community increasingly interconnected and interdependent.  Propositional: "Many countries are reaping the benefits of globalization" (p. 2).  MDGs are country goals (Box. 1.1, p. 3).	Existential: Terrorism exists and requires direct action to combat and defeat. Poverty exists. Human community increasingly interconnected and interdependent. UN is effective means of addressing poverty. UN decisions are morally

	<p>leaders have a duty to all the world's people, especially the most vulnerable.</p>	<p>effective governance will lead to better outcomes for poor. Better-resourced and effective UN (meaning development professionals) will lead to better outcomes for poor.</p> <p>Value: Nation-states and leaders have a duty to all the world's people, especially the most vulnerable. UN and international agreements are effective, authoritative and should be binding. More powerful and better resourced UN is part of solution for world poverty. Substantial shift to neo-liberal/ Rational synoptic theory; for example it becomes more difficult for countries to qualify for debt relief, first they have to be committed to reducing poverty, but then have to demonstrate commitment to eliminating poverty (it becomes much easier then to refuse to reduction or elimination of debt).</p>	<p>numerical goals, targets, indicators are best. Nation-states and leaders have a duty to all the world's poor people.</p>	<p>By coordinated action and commitment we can combat poverty. More effective governance (in particular national governance and local governance). Free market economy and responsible private investment will lead to better outcomes for poor.</p> <p>Value: Human rights, particularly equality, emphasised strongly. Rich have a duty to all the world's people, especially the most vulnerable. Reduction of poverty is aim (not elimination). Free market economy, private investment, yet essential that it is undertaken in ethical and responsible manner. Therefore what might be regarded as values opposed to one another (neo-liberal free market, held together with social values).</p>	<p>correct and binding.</p> <p>Propositional : More effective national governance is required to combat poverty, to deliver internationally agreed development goals including MDGs and combat terrorism. By coordinated action and commitment we can combat terrorism and poverty. More effective governance will lead to better outcomes.</p> <p>Value: Nation-states and leaders have a duty to all the world's people, especially the most vulnerable. UN and international agreements are effective, authoritative and should be binding. More powerful and better resourced UN is part of solution for world poverty. This document moves away from neo-</p>
--	---	--	---	--	--

					liberal agenda and more toward both critical theory and world society theory. It does not speak much of goals or targets, nor does it take for granted that trans-national organisation should be centre stage.
Is there a case for seeing any assumptions as ideological?	Assumptions based on ideals of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Better off nation-states and people have a responsibility to help the poor (link to critical theory especially, assumptions of responsibility rich to poor and structural injustice).	Assumptions based on ideals of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Assumptions that UN agreements are binding and that UN is the common forum for the whole human family.	There are two sets of assumptions that are ideological- the first is that better off nation-states and people have a responsibility to help the poor (link to critical theory especially assumptions of responsibility rich to poor and structural injustice). The second are assumptions that rational synoptic model for decision-making is most effective and that neo-liberal methodology of clear, numerical goals, targets, indicators will deliver most effective results.	Title "Investing in development" includes 2 predominant sets of assumptions, as does the document. Assumptions are interesting combination of two predominant ideological frameworks- 1. neo-liberal economics and 2. Social responsibility of rich to poor, need to ensure high moral/ethical standards for private investors, human rights, equality.  Causal chain poverty breeds terrorism (see p.10 world's leaders being quoted).	Assumptions based on ideals of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Better off nation-states and people have a responsibility to help the poor (link to critical theory especially assumptions of responsibility rich to poor and structural injustice). Also assumption that democracy is the fairest system, connected with freedom and justice, and effective governance.

Semantic/grammatical relations between sentences and clauses (Fairclough Ch. 5)					
Are there higher-level semantic relations over larger stretches of text (e.g. problem-solution)?	Continuous relation between cause and affect. Problem is human choices, structures, action or inaction that have led to current situation, therefore solution also lies in choices, structures, action or inaction. Also assumption that democratic government will deliver better human rights.	Continuous relation between cause and affect. Problem is human choices, structures, action or inaction that have led to current situation. Yet in this text there is a strong semantic relation between problem of poverty and UN, UN agreements as well democratic governments being willing to support proposed UN solutions as critical. Strengthening effectiveness of UN and UN funding are recurring themes which clearly situate the text in its original positioning as strengthening the UN. Also assumption that democratic government will deliver better human rights.	Continuous relation between global problems, goal and target setting.	Cause- effect is predominant in text and implied in proposed solutions. Solutions: better national governance, public funding is for purpose of 'paving the way' for private investment via better infrastructure- which each will benefit from. So the causal chain is: better governance and infrastructure, supported by ODA and FDI, paves way for private investors and free market economy.	Relation between cause and effect not as strong in this text. Does reinforce internationally agreed development goals (although does not specify what they are). But puts emphasis on other issues such as war, terrorism.
Are particularly significant relations of equivalence and difference set up in the text?	Equivalence: does not discuss political or economic differences and tensions at global level- as possible causal factor.  Difference: creates difference between individual societies, democracies and the poor and suffering.	Equivalence: connects terrorism, poor governance, lack of effectiveness UN- then contrasts with the opposite of all those as solution. Explores detrimental effects of globalization as causal factor  Difference: creates difference between poorly governed societies, those not following UN	Relations of equivalence and difference are not set up in the text, but it follows the Millennium Declaration and Road Map relations of equivalence and difference.	Equivalence: Free market economy, infrastructure, governance equated with necessary foundation for lifting out of poverty. Yet underlying layer of complexity in terms of responsibility for human rights, equality, commitment to MDGs. Also handles Africa in sensitive	Equivalence: Democracy is equated with freedom and good governance. National governments having responsibility for development is presented as the best model.  Difference: UN and good governments are contrasted

		<p>agreements with those who are part of the solution for global poverty and other problems. Positions those who are of help very carefully, i.e. democratic governments and those who support UN agreements.</p>		<p>and with cultural/historical reference.</p> <p>Creates difference between poorly governed societies, poor infrastructure as those needing help with those who are part of the solution for global poverty and other problems. Although obvious that contributors to the text are experts with intimate knowledge of what is happening in the field.</p>	<p>with terrorists and war torn regions. Works on underlying assumption that national governance is cause.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Exchanges, speech functions and grammatical mood</b> (Fairclough Ch. 6)</p>					
<p>What are the predominant types of exchange (activity exchange, or knowledge exchange) and speech functions (statement, question, demand, offer)?</p>	<p>Statement-problems and solutions discussed in general terms. Speak as leaders of the world, but at the same time appealing to nations, societies and people to take action. Therefore the agreement is by people who seek to influence outcomes.</p>	<p>Statement-Outline of situation- implicit causal connection between problems and solutions. Problem- UN not strong enough, solution-strengthen, problem- Govt's do not follow UN agreements, solution- follow UN agreements. Problem- poor governance, solution good governance. Problem- debt of low-income countries- solution- reduce of eliminate debt.</p> <p>Logical outline of problem and proposed</p>	<p>Statement-justifies development of selection of goals and targets supported by clear numerical indicators. Still has underlying request for support. Then outlines goals, targets, indicators.</p>	<p>Statement-Obvious expertise of those contributing to the document.</p> <p>Knowledge exchange of situation, causes, solutions and justification for MDGs. Makes a strong case. Yet at the same time- it departs from the 8 MDGs. So there is textured voice recognising complexity of the policy process and social life.</p>	<p>Statement-problems and solutions discussed in general terms. Speak as leaders of the world, but at the same time appealing to nations, societies and people to address issues (slightly less focussed on "taking action" than Millennium Declaration). The "we" is a subset of nation-states or maybe even subset of UN Member-States.</p>

		solutions- therefore report yet also appeal to action.			
What types of statement are there (statements of fact, predictions, hypotheticals, evaluations)?	Combines statements of fact with evaluations, proposals and implicit predictions, although there is no clear distinction between them.	Combines statements of fact with evaluations, proposals and implicit predictions, although there is no clear distinction between them.	Combines proposals, with numerical measurable indicators and implicit predictions.	Combines statement of fact with evaluations and predictions.	Combines statements of fact with evaluations, proposals and implicit predictions, although there is no clear distinction between them.
Are there 'metaphorical' relations between exchanges, speech functions, or types of statement (e.g. demands which appear as statements, evaluations which appear as factual statements?)	Evaluations and ideological statements appear as factual statements.	Yes, there are many evaluations and ideological statements that appear as factual statements. Also proposals for action which appear as guaranteed solutions. Easy answers for complex problems.	Evaluations and assumptions of Millennium Declaration and Road Map are taken for granted in this document. Whilst this is a proposal it appears as a policy text which has already been accepted, approved, decided upon.	Evaluations and ideological statements appear as factual statements. Although these are sometimes qualified of balanced out by more subtle presentation of the complexity of the policy document.	Evaluations and ideological statements are included, yet, whilst still presented as factual statements not as definite as Millennium Declaration. More qualified, nuanced.
What is the predominant grammatical mood (declarative, interrogative, imperative)?	Declarative and imperative. i.e. declares agreement on priorities and action yet appeals to people to support priorities and action.	Imperative. The text is a call to action.	Declarative. Assumes that decision has already been taken- is not imploring international community to take action, rather explaining how they will take action.	Imperative. Text is call to action. Yet is also interrogative of complex social situation and policy process.	Declarative and imperative, yet also interrogative in that it highlights problems and attempts to address UN issues- such as Secretariat taking own direction rather than following UN agreements, and sexual exploitation by UN personnel.

Discourses (Fairclough Ch. 7)					
What discourses are drawn upon in the text, and how are they textured together? Is there a significant mixing of discourses?	Declaration by Heads of state and governments, yet textured together with previous agreements and justification for and appeals to action.	Continual reference to previous UN agreements as solution to world problems. Discourse is quite clear- linking following previous UN agreements as means of achieving goals of Millennium Declaration. Therefore presented as policy continuity.	Previous UN texts, in particular Section III of Millennium Declaration.	Discourse of government using public funding to pave the way for the private sector is predominant throughout text. Discourse of development professionals and organisations specialised in development is predominant. Yet that is mixed with the voice of the UN Secretariat, assuming role as spokesperson for human family.	Millennium Declaration, agreements of 1990's, General Assembly discourse and Security Council concerns over terrorism. Although voice is clearly that of General Assembly- even more so than Millennium Declaration.
What are the features that characterize the discourses drawn upon (semantic relations between words, collocations, metaphors, assumptions, grammatical features)?	Previous UN declarations and agreements- therefore same genre.	Previous UN declarations and agreements- therefore same genre. Although the document also shows Secretary General almost begging people to comply and support. Mixing voice of moral authority with call to action.	Reads as business plan- assumes that decision is made and that plan will be followed.	Combination of social studies analysis and concrete call to action. Complex mixture of features and is not clear what the theoretical foundation of document is. Combines IRCT, CT and WST.  Also very important is use of data and tables which is predominant throughout document and backs up argument for MDGs	Voice of General Assembly, draws upon UN declarations and agreements, yet more concerned with discussion of issues pertinent to world at that time.

Representation of social events (Fairclough Ch. 8)					
What elements of represented social events are included or excluded, and which included elements are most salient?	<p>Included: Historic agreement by heads of state and government. Globalization as a phenomenon that perpetuates injustice and that can be altered or changed by human action.</p> <p>Excluded: Influence of intra and international political and economic complexities. Unpredictability of human social community.</p> <p>Most salient: Concern with positioning UN as forum for entire human community and strengthening effectiveness of UN. Equivalence of democracy with good governance.</p>	<p>Included: Historic agreement by heads of state and government and UN organisations. Detrimental affects of globalization.</p> <p>Excluded: Role of NGOs and civil society- no mention of capitalism.</p> <p>Most salient: Political will and mobilization, development assistance, debt relief and cancellation. Compliance international laws and norms. Positioning UN as forum for entire human community and strengthening effectiveness of UN. Equivalence of democracy with good governance. HIV/AIDS gets substantial attention (at times related to Special Needs of Africa).</p>	<p>Included: UN agreements of the 1990's, Millennium Declaration and Road Map. Millennium Declaration as global agreement.</p>	<p>Included: UN Millennium Summit and MDGs. Yet also EFA- secondary and tertiary education are included- these were not in Millennium Declaration. Private sector as key to meeting the MDGs.</p> <p>Excluded: Majority of goals contained in Millennium Declaration are excluded.</p>	<p>Included: Analysis of then current global situation. In particular concern with security, prevention of war and terrorism. Also included is influence of intra and international political and economic complexities. Unpredictability of human social community.</p> <p>Excluded: (Findings of Practical Plan for Achieving the MDGs).</p> <p>Most salient: Education is broadened from primary and equality to including secondary, technical and higher education. Emphasises importance of UNESCO. Equivalence of democracy and effective national governance with good governance. Threat of terrorism.</p>
How abstractly or concretely are social events represented?	<p>Abstract representation of social events. Occasional concrete representations- such as</p>	<p>Abstract representation of social situation which needs to be addressed, yet more concrete representation of</p>	<p>Concrete representation. Especially representation of current statistics on poverty and measurable</p>	<p>Concrete representation of social events. Strong feature of document are tables containing</p>	<p>Predominantly abstract representation of social events, with more concrete examples-</p>



	"100 million slum dwellers" 19.	UN agreements and bodies.	targets and indicators.	statistics relevant to selected goals and priorities.	such as conduct of UN personnel.
How are processes represented? What are the predominant process types (Material, mental, verbal, relational, existential)?	Material and relational. "Responsibility for managing world-wide economic and social development"	Material. Calls people to support the proposed course of action.	Material. Proposes course of action and measurements of progress.	Material and relational. Shared responsibility for managing world-wide economic and social development.	Relational. Is concerned largely with connection between effective nation-state governance, compliance with UN laws and norms and current global situation.
How are social actors represented (Activated/passivated, personal/impersonal, named/classified, specific/generic)?	Those who can contribute to enactment of resolution are activated. Those whom the resolution is trying to help are passivated. All social actors are classified and are represented as impersonal.	Those who can contribute to enactment of resolution are activated. Those whom the resolution is trying to help are passivated. Most social actors are classified and are represented as impersonal, but UN and related funds and agencies are often personal, named and specific.	Social actors are activated, although not specified. Targets and indicators are clear- yet no indication of who or how they will be delivered.	Social actors such as governments and UN and related organisations are activated. Targets are often specific. In particular UN organisations are named and directly associated with particular goals.  Reference to private sector is passivated and impersonal. There is little or no specific description of exactly what the private sector will do in relation to the MDGs or how they will do it. Works on assumption of causal chain as outlined above. Governance, public sector funding and infrastructure pave the way for private sector. This is	Social actors are activated, UN Personnel, national governments . Although not named, Classification is subtle yet still groups UN priorities with good governance, democracy and peace. Yet also nuances UN-criticising UN personnel (development professionals ) for unethical conduct and sexual exploitation.

				a questionable set of assumptions given the ability of global private sector organisations to shift tax burdens.	
<b>Styles</b> <b>(Fairclough Ch. 9)</b>					
What styles are drawn upon in the text, and how are they textured together?	Declaration, yet at the same time appeal for commitment to action	Report and appeal to action. Reporting in progress so far, proposing course of action, appealing to those whose support is required to support the course of action-which appears as a 'given' simply requiring support to enact and then problems with be solved. Simplistic.	Report and plan. Reports that various organisations have worked together and then outlines the goals, targets and indicators.	Predominantly declaration (for moral purpose), report (for information from task groups) and plan (to engender action).	Resolution: Draws together results of proceedings. Clearly issues that have been raised or discussed by General Assembly are included. Even issues that are still under consideration , open, complex. However does NOT include goals, targets, objectives. Relates back to Millennium Declaration and does not follow the Secretary General's report (2001).
Is there a significant mixing of styles?	Yes- it combines declaration by heads of state and yet also appeal to action. Seems to be declaration by leaders who do not have control on the outcome.	Yes- combines report, with establishing moral framework (compliance with apparently cohesive body of UN agreements and policies), with appeal to action.	No. It is a brief document proposing a framework for action.	Yes- combines declaration, report, with establishing moral framework (compliance with apparently cohesive body of UN agreements and policies), with appeal to action, with more complex discussion of	Yes. It is in the style of a resolution, but still functions as tool to consider contemporary global issues. Close to style of Millennium Declaration.

				cause and effect, that in some contradicts above, or at least shows input of development professionals 'on the ground'.	
<b>Modality (Fairclough Ch. 10)</b>					
What do authors commit themselves to in terms of truth (epistemic modalities)? Or in terms of obligation and necessity (deontic modalities)?	<p>Truth: Poverty exists, the 'human family' can address poverty, implying that the 'human family' are the cause of poverty, democracy is the most just form of government, human family is inter-dependent, UN indispensable common house of human family.</p> <p>Obligation: we share responsibility to address human suffering, to make UN more effective, whole range of issues to be addressed (e.g. approx. 63 goals identified), democratic governance.</p>	<p>Truth: Poverty exists, the 'human family' can address poverty, implying that the 'human family' are the cause of poverty, democracy is the most just form of government, human family is inter-dependent, UN indispensable common house of human family, UN agreements and policies are a consistent and, if complied with, will address the problems.</p> <p>Obligation: Must strengthen UN, we share responsibility to address human suffering, governance.</p>	<p>Truth: Measurable targets are most effective. Limited number if achievable targets better than broad of unachievable. Therefore assumption that Millennium Declaration is unachievable. Poverty exists, the 'human family' can address poverty, implying that the 'human family' are the cause of poverty, human family is inter-dependent.</p> <p>Obligation: Share responsibility to address human suffering.</p>	<p>Truth: There is natural and automatic causal link between national governance, public investment in infrastructure, improved infrastructure, paving the way for private investors, greater wealth and lifting people from poverty, therefore achieving MDGs. Poverty exists, the 'human family' can address poverty, yet poverty exists due to poor governance and lack of infrastructure.</p> <p>Obligation: we share responsibility to address and alleviate human suffering.</p>	
To what extent are the modalities categorical (assertion, denial), to what extent are they modalized (with explicit markers of	The text is mostly categorical. Handling poverty and suffering as facts, with assumption of	The text is almost exclusively categorical. Outlining causes and solutions as givens.	The text is categorical. Agreements have been made, this Annex is promoted as the best	Text combines both categorical and modalized. Data and proposals for action often	Mostly categorical but also modalized in relation to handling of issues such as

modality)?	mutual obligation to fix. Although does not specify exactly who it is that should fix. In other words the line between the have's and have not's is not clear.		means of achieving a proportion of those targets.	categorical, yet discussion of issues and poverty 'on the ground' modalized.	corruption, cause and effect between good governance, democracy and justice.
What levels of commitment are there (high, medium, low) where modalities are modalized?	High level of commitment as per resolution, but assumption that human community will not do what is required to address poverty and human suffering.	High level of commitment called for- degree to which Secretary General appeals for support indicates substantially lower level of support than desired by Secretary General.	High level of commitment was called for in main document, in the annex there is an assumed level of commitment.	High level of commitment evidenced throughout text and various reports of working groups.	High level of commitment called for.
<b>Evaluation (Fairclough Ch. 10)</b>					
To what values (in terms of desirable or undesirable) do authors commit themselves?	The values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.	Compliance with international laws and norms, political will and mobilization, the values of the previous UN agreements, development and debt relief.	The values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.	The values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Millennium Declaration, within that the MDGs.	The values of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Compliance with international laws and norms, political will and mobilization, the values of the previous UN agreements. Good governance, national sovereignty.
How are values realized- as evaluative statements, statements with deontic modalities, statements with affective mental processes, or assumed values?	Evaluative statements about poverty and suffering, UN as common house for human family and shared responsibility to act are evaluative	Evaluative statements presented as universally agreed facts and values. Although hard data about slum dwellers, illness is present.	Assumed values. This text does not attempt to justify the proposed goals, targets, indicators. Rather takes it as a given that this is	Overarching text is statements with deontic modalities. Yet also nuanced handling of complexity of global poverty and proposed solutions.	Evaluative statements are predominant, and assumptions about universally agreed values, although still nuanced and

	statements presented as universally agreed facts and values. Yet at the same time there is an underlying appeal to act and appeal to strengthen effectiveness of UN. So there is a contradiction.		what should happen.		shows complexity of global situation and attempts to address injustice and poverty.
<b>Other questions</b>					
How many goals/ objectives/ targets/ indicators are identified in the document?*			8 goals 18 targets 48 indicators	8 goals 18 targets (yet adds further priorities, such as secondary and tertiary education, without referring to as goals).	none
What individuals are acknowledged as contributors?*		Secretary General	Secretary General	As per noted above	none
Who or what are identified as the causes of global poverty?*		Not following UN agreements, poor/non democratic governance, negative effects of globalization, spiralling debt of lower income countries, war, terrorism, lack of political will, lack of resources.	No causes identified. Implicit in solutions.	In part nuanced discussion accounting for complexity of global economic and social situation. Mostly identifies poor national governance, lack of infrastructure and environmental causes such as soil degradation and low rainfall.	Poor/non democratic governance, spiralling debt of lower income countries, war, terrorism, lack of political will, lack of resources. Secretariat also implicated in not following UN agreements.
Who or what are identified as responsible for solving global poverty?*		UN and related organisations, governments.	UN, related organisations , governments	National governments for infrastructure, private sector for improving economy and flow on effect	National governments are centre stage, as well as UN and related organisations .

				<p>for raising people from poverty. Although no detail as to how this will occur.</p> <p>UN and related organizations are barely ever mentioned as part of solution to problem</p>	
Who or what influenced the policy process, including any filtering and selection processes?*	No information contained in policy text, yet is resolution of General Assembly. Formed part of UN Millennium Summit, including Heads of State and leaders of nation-states.	According to policy text was Heads of State and Govt. via Millennium Declaration, UN system, Bretton Woods Institutions, World Trade Organization, inter-governmental organizations, international organizations, regional organizations, civil society.	According to policy text was UN Secretariat, IMF, OECD, World Bank.	<p>According to text- world's MDGs, UN Secretariat, UN Millennium Project (comprised of task forces and over 250 task force members/ experts from around the world including: scientists, development practitioners, parliamentarians, policymakers, representatives of civil society, UN Agencies, the World Bank, The IMF, the Private sector.</p> <p>UN Development Programme Administrator- Mark Malloch Brown in capacity as chair of UN Development Group.</p>	No information in policy text, yet is resolution of General Assembly. Formed part of genre chain following UN Millennium Summit, yet contextualises in current global situation.
What are the genesis, assumptions and ideological stances of the policy text?*	First record of UN decision to hold Millennium Summit is a resolution about	First record of UN decision to hold Millennium Summit is a resolution about renewing the UN, therefore basis of	Follows Millennium Declaration and Road Map. Yet ideological stance is	Follows UN Road Map Annex. Varied assumptions, multiple voices in text, ranging from neo-	Follows UN Millennium Summit. Also based in UN humanitarian values and agreements

	<p>renewing the UN, therefore basis of Millennium Declaration is A/RES/52/12- Renewing the UN, A programme for reform</p> <p>Also based in UN humanitarian values and agreements of UN.</p>	<p>Millennium Declaration and Road Map is A/RES/52/12- Renewing the UN, A programme for reform</p> <p>Also based in UN humanitarian values and agreements of UN.</p>	<p>different in that it follows neo-liberal, rational synoptic thinking more-so than any other. Yet still with underlying assumptions of Critical and World Society Theories of the responsibility of rich and powerful to help poor and powerless.</p>	<p>liberal, to critical/social democratic. Largely assumes government and public funding paves the way for private enterprise, and that from that people will be raised out of poverty.</p>	<p>of UN. Assumes UN is common forum for human family, yet also challenges UN personnel, Secretariat and Secretary General.</p>
Who is being empowered and disempowered in the policy process?*	The 'poor' are not speaking, but are being spoken about.	<p>Empowering UN- in particular compliance with International and UN laws and norms. Empowering UN development professionals and related organisations. Disempowering governments to make their own choices. Very little, if any, recognition of NGOs, individuals, other groups contributing to solutions. Certainly no recognition of their potential input to solutions.</p>	<p>Empowering UN- in particular compliance with International and UN laws and norms. Empowering UN development professionals and related organisations . Disempowering governments to make their own choices. Very little, if any, recognition of NGOs, individuals, other groups contributing to solutions. No recognition of their potential input to solutions.</p>	<p>Private sector has whole chapter devoted to it. Unsure whether or not national governments are being empowered. Are burdened with responsibility for delivering the MDGs when there is no evidence that the world, or civil society, or the UN General assembly voted for them. Document states "This publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme, or their Member States" (2005, introductory notes).</p>	<p>Empowered- UN in particular compliance with International and UN laws and norms. Maybe national- governments , although it could also be interpreted as the UN General Assembly, having decided "Internationally agreed development goals" is putting pressure, responsibility and eventually blame on national- governments for non-delivery of goals.</p>

## Appendix 2: Tracking priorities chart

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
	1996	2000	2000	2001	2001	2005	Post 2007
<b>Peace, security and disarmament</b>			We will spare no effort to free our peoples from the scourge of war, whether within or between States, which has claimed more than 5 million lives in the past decade.				
			We will also seek to eliminate the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction.				
			To strengthen respect for the rule of law in international as in national affairs and, in particular, to ensure compliance by Member States with the decisions of the International Court of Justice, in compliance with the Charter of the United Nations, in cases to which they are parties.	(Combined with other priority below, therefore included).			



	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To make the United Nations more effective in maintaining peace and security by giving it the resources and tools it needs for conflict prevention, peaceful resolution of disputes, peacekeeping, post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction. In this context, we take note of the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations and request the General Assembly to consider its recommendations expeditiously.	✓			
			To strengthen cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To ensure the implementation, by States Parties, of treaties in areas such as arms control and disarmament and of international humanitarian law and human rights law, and call upon all States to consider signing and ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.	Strengthen the international rule of law and compliance with the International Court of Justice and the Charter of the United Nations, ensure the implementation by States parties of treaties in such areas as arms control and disarmament and of international humanitarian law and human rights law, and call upon all States to consider signing and ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.			
			To take concerted action against international terrorism, and to accede as soon as possible to all the relevant international conventions.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To redouble our efforts to implement our commitment to counter the world drug problem.	✓			
			To intensify our efforts to fight transnational crime in all its dimensions, including trafficking as well as smuggling in human beings and money laundering.	✓			
			To minimize the adverse effects of United Nations economic sanctions on innocent populations, to subject such sanctions regimes to regular reviews and to eliminate the adverse effects of sanctions on third parties.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons, and to keep all options open for achieving this aim, including the possibility of convening an international conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers.	✓			
			To take concerted action to end illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons, especially by making arms transfers more transparent and supporting regional disarmament measures, taking account of all the recommendations of the forthcoming United Nations Conference on Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To call on all States to consider acceding to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, as well as the amended mines protocol to the Convention on conventional weapons.	✓			
			We urge Member States to observe the Olympic Truce, individually and collectively, now and in the future, and to support the International Olympic Committee in its efforts to promote peace and human understanding through sport and the Olympic Ideal.	✓			
III. Development and poverty eradication			We will spare no effort to free our fellow men, women and children from the abject and dehumanizing conditions of extreme poverty, to which more than a billion of them are currently subjected.				

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			We are committed to making the right to development a reality for everyone and to freeing the entire human race from want.				
			We resolve therefore to create an environment – at the national and global levels alike – which is conducive to development and to the elimination of poverty.				

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			<p>Success in meeting these objectives depends, <i>inter alia</i>, on good governance within each country. It also depends on good governance at the international level and on transparency in the financial, monetary and trading systems.</p> <p>We are committed to an open, <b>equitable</b>, rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trading and financial system. We are concerned about the obstacles developing countries face in mobilizing the resources needed to finance their sustained development.</p>	✓	Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system. Includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction — both nationally and internationally.	✓	Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.
			We will therefore make every effort to ensure the success of the High-level International and Intergovernmental Event on Financing for Development, to be held in 2001.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex: Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			We also undertake to address the special needs of the least developed countries. In this context, we welcome the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries to be held in May 2001 and will endeavour to ensure its success. We call on the industrialized countries:	✓	Address the needs of the least developed countries  Includes: tariff and quota free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC's and cancellation of official bilateral debt;	✓	Address the special needs of least developed countries.
			To adopt, preferably by the time of that Conference, a policy of duty- and quota-free access for essentially all exports from the least developed countries;	✓			



	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To implement the enhanced programme of debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries without further delay and to agree to cancel all official bilateral debts of those countries in return for their making demonstrable commitments to poverty <b>reduction</b> .	To implement the enhanced programme of debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries without further delay, and to agree to cancel all official bilateral debts of those countries in return for their making demonstrable commitments to poverty <b>eradication</b> .			
			To grant more generous development assistance, especially to countries that are genuinely making an effort to apply their resources to poverty reduction.	✓	and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty <b>reduction</b> .	✓	

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			We are also determined to deal comprehensively and effectively with the debt problems of low- and middle-income developing countries, through various national and international measures designed to make their debt sustainable in the long <b>term</b> .	Deal comprehensively <b>and effectively</b> with the debt problems of low- and middle-income developing countries, through various national and international measures designed to make their debt sustainable in the long <b>run</b> .	Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long <b>term</b> .	✓	Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries.
			We also resolve to address the special needs of small island developing States, by implementing the Barbados Programme of Action and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly rapidly and in full. We urge the international community to ensure that, in the development of a vulnerability index, the special needs of small island developing States are taken into account.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			We recognize the special needs and problems of the landlocked developing countries, and urge both bilateral and multilateral donors to increase financial and technical assistance to this group of countries to meet their special development needs and to help them overcome the impediments of geography by improving their transit transport systems.	✓	Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing States.  (Through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly).	✓	Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing States.
	A reduction by one-half in the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015.	Reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by half between 1990 and 2015.	To halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than one dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger and, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe	✓	Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day.	✓	Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty & hunger  Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1.25 a day.

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			drinking water.		Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.	✓	✓
					Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water.	Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.	✓
	Universal primary education in all countries by 2015.	Enrol all children in primary school by 2015.	To ensure that, by the same date, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and that girls and boys will have equal access to	✓	Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	✓	✓

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
	Demonstrated progress toward gender equality and the empowerment of women by eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education by 2005.	Make progress towards gender equality and empowering women by eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005.	all levels of education.	✓	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	✓	✓
	A reduction by two-thirds in the mortality rates for infants and children under age 5 and a reduction by three-fourths in maternal mortality, all by 2015.	Reduce infant and child mortality rates by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015.	By the same date, to have reduced maternal mortality by three quarters, and under-five child mortality by two thirds, of their current rates.	✓	Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.	✓	✓
		Reduce maternal mortality ratios by three-quarters between 1990 and 2015.			Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.	✓	✓

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
	Access through the primary health-care system to reproductive health services for all individuals of appropriate ages as soon as possible and no later than the year 2015.	Provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015.					Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health.
			To have, by then, halted, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, the scourge of malaria and other major diseases that afflict humanity.	✓	Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS	✓	✓
							Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it.
					Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.	✓	✓
				✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers as proposed in the "Cities Without Slums" initiative.	✓	✓	✓	Achieve, by 2020, a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers.
			To promote gender equality and the empowerment of women as effective ways to combat poverty, hunger and disease and to stimulate development that is truly sustainable.	✓	Promote gender equality and empower women:  Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	✓	✓
			To develop and implement strategies that give young people everywhere a real chance to find decent and productive work.	✓	In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth.	✓	Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people.

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To encourage the pharmaceutical industry to make essential drugs <b>more widely available and affordable by all who need them</b> in developing countries.	✓	In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, <b>provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries.</b>	✓	✓
			To develop strong partnerships with the private sector and with civil society organizations in pursuit of development and poverty eradication.				
			To ensure that the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication technologies, in conformity with recommendations contained in the ECOSOC 2000 Ministerial Declaration, are available to all.	✓	In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications.	✓	✓



	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
<b>IV. Protecting our common environment</b>			We must spare no effort to free all of humanity, and above all our children and grandchildren, from the threat of living on a planet irredeemably spoilt by human activities, and whose resources would no longer be sufficient for their needs.				
	The current implementation of national strategies for sustainable development in all countries by 2005, so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015.	Implement national strategies for sustainable development by 2005 so as to reverse the loss of environmental resources by 2015.	We reaffirm our support for the principles of sustainable development, including those set out in Agenda 21, agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.		Ensure environmental sustainability: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.	✓	✓

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			We resolve therefore to adopt in all our environmental actions a new ethic of conservation and stewardship and, as first steps, we resolve:				
			To make every effort to ensure the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol, preferably by the tenth anniversary of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 2002, and to embark on the required reduction in emissions of greenhouse gases.	✓			
			To intensify our collective efforts for the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forests.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To press for the full implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa.	✓			Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss.
			To stop the unsustainable exploitation of water resources by developing water management strategies at the regional, national and local levels, which promote both equitable access and adequate supplies.	✓			
			To intensify cooperation to reduce the number and effects of natural and man-made disasters.	To intensify our collective efforts to reduce the number and effects of natural and man-made disasters.			
			To ensure free access to information on the human genome sequence.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
V. Human rights, democracy and good governance			We will spare no effort to promote democracy and strengthen the rule of law, as well as respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development.				
			To respect fully and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.	To respect and fully uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and			
			To strive for the full protection and promotion in all our countries of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all.	strive for the full protection and promotion in all countries of civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all.  <b>(Note: 2 goals from Millennium Declaration were combined into one in Road Map)</b>			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To strengthen the capacity of all our countries to implement the principles and practices of democracy and respect for human rights, including minority rights.	✓			
			To combat all forms of violence against women and to implement the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.	✓			
			To take measures to ensure respect for and protection of the human rights of migrants, migrant workers and their families, to eliminate the increasing acts of racism and xenophobia in many societies and to promote greater harmony and tolerance in all societies.	✓			
			To work collectively for more inclusive political processes, allowing genuine participation by all citizens in all our countries.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To ensure the freedom of the media to perform their essential role and the right of the public to have access to information.	✓			
<b>VI. Protecting the vulnerable</b>			We will spare no effort to ensure that children and all civilian populations that suffer disproportionately the consequences of natural disasters, genocide, armed conflicts and other humanitarian emergencies are given every assistance and protection so that they can resume normal life as soon as possible.				
			To expand and strengthen the protection of civilians in complex emergencies, in conformity with international humanitarian law.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To strengthen international cooperation, including burden sharing in, and the coordination of humanitarian assistance to, countries hosting refugees and to help all refugees and displaced persons to return voluntarily to their homes, in safety and dignity and to be smoothly reintegrated into their societies.	✓			
			To encourage the ratification and full implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and its optional protocols on the involvement of children in armed conflict and on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
<b>VII. Meeting the special needs of Africa</b>			We will support the consolidation of democracy in Africa and assist Africans in their struggle for lasting peace, poverty eradication and sustainable development, thereby bringing Africa into the mainstream of the world economy.				
			To give full support to the political and institutional structures of emerging democracies in Africa.	✓			
			To encourage and sustain regional and subregional mechanisms for preventing conflict and promoting political stability, and to ensure a reliable flow of resources for peacekeeping operations on the continent.	✓			



	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To take special measures to address the challenges of poverty eradication and sustainable development in Africa, including debt cancellation, improved market access, enhanced Official Development Assistance and increased flows of Foreign Direct Investment, as well as transfers of technology.	✓			
			To help Africa build up its capacity to tackle the spread of the HIV/AIDS pandemic and other infectious diseases.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
<b>VIII. Strengthening the United Nations</b>			We will spare no effort to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for pursuing all of these priorities: the fight for development for all the peoples of the world, the fight against poverty, ignorance and disease; the fight against injustice; the fight against violence, terror and crime; and the fight against the degradation and destruction of our common home.				
			To reaffirm the central position of the General Assembly as the chief deliberative, policy-making and representative organ of the United Nations, and to enable it to play that role effectively.	✓			
			To intensify our efforts to achieve a comprehensive reform of the Security Council in all its aspects.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To strengthen further the Economic and Social Council, building on its recent achievements, to help it fulfil the role ascribed to it in the Charter.	✓			
			To strengthen the International Court of Justice, in order to ensure justice and the rule of law in international affairs.	✓			
			To encourage regular consultations and coordination among the principal organs of the United Nations in pursuit of their functions.	✓			
			To ensure that the Organization (UN) is provided on a timely and predictable basis with the resources it needs to carry out its mandates.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To urge the Secretariat to make the best use of those resources, in accordance with clear rules and procedures agreed by the General Assembly, in the interests of all Member States, by adopting the best management practices and technologies available <b>and by concentrating on those tasks that reflect the agreed priorities of Member States.</b>	To urge the Secretariat to make the best use of those resources, in accordance with clear rules and procedures agreed by the General Assembly, in the interests of all Member States, by adopting the best management practices and technologies available.			
			To promote adherence to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.	✓			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To ensure greater policy coherence and better cooperation between the United Nations, its agencies, the Bretton Woods Institutions and the World Trade Organization, as well as other multilateral bodies, <b>with a view to achieving a fully coordinated approach to the problems of peace and development.</b>	To ensure greater policy coherence and better cooperation between the United Nations, its agencies, the Bretton Woods institutions and the World Trade Organization, as well as other multilateral bodies.			
			To strengthen further cooperation between the United Nations and national parliaments through their world organization, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, <b>in various fields, including peace and security, economic and social development, international law and human rights and democracy and gender issues.</b>	To strengthen further cooperation between the United Nations and the Inter Parliamentary Union.			

	Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex. Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form MDGs
			To give greater opportunities to the private sector, non-governmental organizations and civil society, in general, to contribute to the realization of the Organization's goals and programmes.	✓			

### Appendix 3: Tracking MDG priorities

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
1996	2000	2000	2001	2001	2005 (Jan)	Post 2007
		We are committed to an open, <b>equitable</b> , rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory multilateral trading and financial system. We are concerned about the obstacles developing countries face in mobilizing the resources needed to finance their sustained development.	✓	Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system. Includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction — both nationally and internationally .	✓	Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system.

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		We also undertake to address the special needs of the least developed countries. In this context, we welcome the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries to be held in May 2001 and will endeavour to ensure its success. We call on the industrialized countries:	✓	Address the needs of the least developed countries.  Includes: tariff and quota free access for least developed countries' exports; enhanced programme of debt relief for HIPC's and cancellation of official bilateral debt;	✓	Address the special needs of least developed countries.
		To adopt, preferably by the time of that Conference, a policy of duty- and quota-free access for essentially all exports from the least developed countries;	✓			



Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		We are also determined to deal comprehensively and effectively with the debt problems of low- and middle-income developing countries, through various national and international measures designed to make their debt sustainable in the long <b>term</b> .	Deal comprehensively <b>and effectively</b> with the debt problems of low- and middle income developing countries, through various national and international measures designed to make their debt sustainable in the long <b>run</b> .	Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long <b>term</b> .	✓	Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries.

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		We recognize the special needs and problems of the landlocked developing countries, and urge both bilateral and multilateral donors to increase financial and technical assistance to this group of countries to meet their special development needs and to help them overcome the impediments of geography by improving their transit transport systems.	✓	Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states.  (through the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States and the outcome of the twenty-second special session of the General Assembly).	✓	Address the special needs of landlocked developing countries and small island developing states.
A reduction by one-half in the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015.	Reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by half between 1990 and 2015.	To halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than one dollar a day and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger and, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to	✓	Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than one dollar a day.	✓	Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty & hunger  Target 1.A: Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1.25 a day.

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		reach or to afford safe drinking water.		Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.	✓	✓
				Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water.	Halve by 2015 the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.	✓
Universal primary education in all countries by 2015.	Enrol all children in primary school by 2015.	To ensure that, by the same date, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling and	✓	Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	✓	✓

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
Demonstrated progress toward gender equality and the empowerment of women by eliminating gender disparity in primary and secondary education by 2005.	Make progress towards gender equality and empowering women by eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005.	that girls and boys will have equal access to all levels of education.	✓	Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	✓	✓
A reduction by two-thirds in the mortality rates for infants and children under age 5 and a reduction by three-fourths in maternal mortality, all by 2015.	Reduce infant and child mortality rates by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015.	By the same date, to have reduced maternal mortality by three quarters, and under-five child mortality by two thirds, of their current rates.	✓	Reduce by two thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.	✓	✓
	Reduce maternal mortality ratios by three-quarters between 1990 and 2015.			Reduce by three quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.	✓	✓

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
Access through the primary health-care system to reproductive health services for all individuals of appropriate ages as soon as possible and no later than the year 2015.	Provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015.					Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health.
		To have, by then, halted, and begun to reverse, the spread of HIV/AIDS, the scourge of malaria and other major diseases that afflict humanity.	✓	Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.	✓	✓
						Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV/AIDS for all those who need it.
				Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.	✓	✓

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		By 2020, to have achieved a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers as proposed in the "Cities Without Slums" initiative.	✓	✓	✓	Achieve, by 2020, a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers.
		To promote gender equality and the empowerment of women as effective ways to combat poverty, hunger and disease and to stimulate development that is truly sustainable.	✓	Promote gender equality and empower women:  Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005, and to all levels of education no later than 2015.	✓	✓
		To develop and implement strategies that give young people everywhere a real chance to find decent and productive work.	✓	In cooperation with developing countries, develop and implement strategies for decent and productive work for youth.	✓	Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people.

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
		To encourage the pharmaceutical industry to make essential drugs <b>more widely available and affordable by all who need them</b> in developing countries.	✓	In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, <b>provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries.</b>	✓	✓
		To ensure that the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communication technologies, in conformity with recommendations contained in the ECOSOC 2000 Ministerial Declaration, are available to all.	✓	In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies, especially information and communications.	✓	✓

Shaping the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century	A Better World For All	Millennium Declaration /RES/55/2	Road Map A/56/326	Annex, Road Map A/56/326	Investing in Development	Current form of MDGs
The current implementation of national strategies for sustainable development in all countries by 2005, so as to ensure that current trends in the loss of environmental resources are effectively reversed at both global and national levels by 2015.	Implement national strategies for sustainable development by 2005 so as to reverse the loss of environmental resources by 2015	We reaffirm our support for the principles of sustainable development, including those set out in Agenda 21, agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development.		Ensure environmental sustainability: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes and reverse the loss of environmental resources.	✓	✓
		To press for the full implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, particularly in Africa.	✓			Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss.



#### Appendix 4: List of 1990's summits, agreements, texts

1990	World Conference on Education for All, Jomtien: <i>World Declaration on Education for All</i>
1992	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Rio: <i>Convention on bio-diversity, Convention on Climate Change</i>
1993	World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna: <i>Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action</i>
1995	World Summit for Social Development, Copenhagen: <i>The Copenhagen Declaration</i>
1996	World Food Summit, Rome: <i>Rome Declaration on World Food Security</i>
1996	Thirty-Fourth High Level Meeting of the Development Assistance Committee, Paris: <i>Shaping the 21st Century</i>
1997	UNESCO's 29 <sup>th</sup> General Conference: <i>Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights</i>
1998	<i>Global Campaign for Ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Migrants</i>
1998	World Health Organisation: <i>Roll Back Malaria Campaign</i>
1999	UN General Assembly: <i>International Strategy on Disaster Reduction</i>
2000	World Education Forum, Dakar: <i>The Dakar Framework for Action</i>
2000	UN, Montreal: <i>Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety</i>
2000	World Water Forum, the Hague
2000	UN General Assembly Special Session on the Social Summit +5, Geneva. <i>A Better World for All</i>

## Appendix 5: Letter Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser to Secretary General

Text below is from <http://www.rorg.no/Artikler/724.html> [Accessed 19 October 2014].

"The following letter was sent on 28 June 2000 by WCC General Secretary Rev. Dr. Konrad Raiser to United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan. Raiser's letter is a response to a report entitled *A Better World for All* issued jointly by the UN Secretary-General with the senior officers of the OECD, the World Bank and the IMF at the opening of "Geneva 2000" - the UN Special Session on Social Development currently underway in Geneva" (RORG 2014).

"Dear Mr Secretary-General,

We were gratified by your presence at the Cathédrale Saint Pierre this past Sunday, and for your public words there and elsewhere in recent weeks about what is at stake in "Geneva 2000".

It is therefore with some regret that I feel compelled to write to you with respect to the report, *A Better World for All*, that you issued jointly with the senior officers of the OECD, the World Bank and the IMF as the Summit opened.

This report was received with great astonishment, disappointment and even anger by many representatives of civil society and of non-governmental organizations gathered in Geneva to support and encourage the Special Session on Social Development following your consistent injunction to move the world closer to placing controls on the negative features of globalization. Among these representatives are members of the Ecumenical Team coordinated by the World Council of Churches.

The consternation of these civil society representatives, and a good many of the government delegates as well, was aroused by your participation in what amounted to a propaganda exercise for international finance institutions whose policies are widely held to be at the root of many of the most grave social problems facing the poor all over the world and especially those in the poor nations. We and many other non-

governmental organizations have consistently supported the United Nations and encouraged you in efforts to address the injustices embodied in these institutions. By identifying yourself with the goals and the vision promoted by this report in your address to the General Assembly on 26 June, you have cast doubt upon the will of the United Nations to reaffirm the Copenhagen commitments and translate them into effective strategies for the eradication of poverty and further significant progress towards the goals of a people-centered approach to social development.

The World Council of Churches addresses these concerns to you not as a simplistic criticism of the United Nations or of your role as its Secretary-General. The WCC has been with the UN as a supporter and cooperating body since the San Francisco Conference. While we have not hesitated to issue our critique when it was due, we have done so as an organization deeply committed to the aims of the Charter, and as one substantially involved in many of the aspects of the work of the Organization. You are well aware of our consistent efforts to sustain and support you personally in your enlightened approach to leadership of the world body in challenging and critical times. Thus we warmly welcomed the statement in your Millennium Report that the challenges of globalization need a functioning platform for States "working together on global issues - all pulling their weight and all having their say."

We have noted with dismay in recent years how the UN's development agenda has floundered as more and more responsibility for global economic and trade reform was ceded to the World Trade Organization and the Bretton Woods institutions controlled by a small number of highly industrialized countries. Their policies have not only failed to bridge the gap between rich and poor and achieve greater equality, but rather contributed to a widening gap, the virtual exclusion of an increasing number of the poor and widespread social disintegration. The OECD, comprised exclusively of rich countries can hardly be said to have the interests of the poor nations at the centre of its concerns.

By privileging these organizations as your partners in presenting a vision to UNGASS, considerable damage has been done to the credibility of the UN as the last real hope of the victims of globalization. It signals an acceptance of the logic of the market and could further limit space for governments and civil society to develop alternative goals and means to achieving social development through democratic and transparent

processes. The question of how major international decisions are made has become one of pressing urgency in the world today. If the UN abdicates its independence and its authority, to whom are the peoples to turn?

I am deeply aware of the difficulties involved in the burdens you have been asked to carry. Repeatedly you have said that the change for which you and we have all hoped through this Special Session would come in large part through the imagination, technical skills and courage of civil society to press the case of the people. You have often appealed to these forces as your source of hope and support. The motto of our own ecumenical team which has participated actively since Copenhagen in the preparation of Geneva 2000 has been: "A Change of Heart." In this spirit, we remain with and stand behind you, encouraging you to hold steadfastly to your oft-stated goals for this Social Summit."

## Appendix 6: General Assembly debate regarding *Road Map*

### *Annex*

A/56/PV.58 and A/56/PV.59

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
Russian Federation	✓	✓		Support draft resolution, peace and security, terrorism, HIV/AIDS.
India	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration can only be implemented by Member States, poverty, ODA, Pharmaceutical Industry (availability of generic medication saving lives of millions), cannot rely on altruism of multinational corporations, ICT-India willing partner, Africa development- not donor-dictated package.
Algeria	✓	✓	✓	Surprise that neither Secretary General nor representative of present, youth employment, use integrated and balanced approach- current machinery, periodic evaluation, late provision of Road Map- inadequate time to prepare, tired from previous debate, Monterrey, debt, role of GA.
Senegal	✓	✓		Globalization, interdependence, peace and security/disarmament, development, environment, poverty eradication, human rights, democracy, good governance, agricultural subsidies yet asked to open markets, rich and poor, financing, conflict prevention, Africa, HIV/AIDS, strengthening UN.
Egypt	✓	✓		Peace and Security, terrorism, participation of developing countries in decision making, rule of law, democratic deficit in UN policy processes must be addressed (goes to the heart of good governance), desertification, HIV/AIDS
Croatia	✓	✓		Terrorism, peace and security, discrimination against women/gender perspective, human rights, rule of law, development.
Belgium	✓	✓	✓	UN, freedom, solidarity, tolerance, terrorism, Road Map as first step, provide regular report against markers provided in Annex.
Hungary	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration as outstanding document providing fundamental commitments,

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				economic slowdown, unemployment, national strategies.
Mongolia	✓	✓	✓	Blueprint, some goals too general, government commitment, address problems of landlocked countries, economic difficulties, concrete targets required, poverty.
Namibia	✓	✓		Trade barriers, have and have nots, focus on implementation, women's participation and rights, children's rights, war, peace building, HIV/AIDS, debt relief Africa indispensable, reform security council too slow.
Malaysia	✓	✓	✓	Lack of political will, rule of law at international level, acceded to over 500 treaties and conventions, global military spending increasing whilst people are starving, nuclear weapons/weapons of mass destruction.
Singapore	✓	✓	✓	Lack of delivery on past agreements, Annex most useful section, objective analysis of road blocks that prevented implementation in the past, have to walk the talk- article by Joe Stiglitz- emphasise interdependence, market protection by rich countries but force developing countries to open markets (structural roadblock), power in international relations, Road Map 1 year overdue, maybe because interests of the group lie in it not being completed, draft resolution to support the Road Map.
Belarus	✓	✓		Terrorism, considering country views, practical steps.
Peru	✓	✓	✓	Generally favourable view of Road Map, international laws and norms, human rights, democracy, good governance, need for greater transparency in management of world economy, actions suggested inadequate for developing countries, trade liberalization led to worse situation for developing countries, Road Map needs to be more specific, must include strengthening role of GA and reform of Security Council, government responsibility for reducing poverty.
Guatemala	✓	✓	✓	Millennium Summit was for a better world, well being, democracy, safety, world has gone backward since Millennium Declaration, global recession, terrorism, Millennium Declaration

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				important, Annex eloquent, Millennium Declaration statute- RM regulation, merits of Road Map, reporting back should be normal annual report- not something separate- as this is item of GA, RM defective in addressing the means of implementing the strategies proposed, still see RM as the document which is the plan for delivery of whole Millennium Declaration, leaves out 'thorny issues', useful compliment to the Millennium Declaration (but not a replacement), coordinated approach required.
Bhutan	✓	✓		Millennium Summit- landmark event, HIV/AIDS, poverty alleviation, social and economic development, Millennium Declaration as firm mandate, inter-connected solutions, terrorism (9/11), alleviation of poverty, Malaria and TB, environment, ODA, people centred development, rhetoric into action.
Debate continued- A/56/PV.59				
Ukraine	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration outstanding achievement, terrorism (9/11), peace, Road Map concise and comprehensive and practical, should achieve all goals of Millennium Declaration, MDGs national, responsibility rests with governments, globalization needs to be positive force, conflict prevention, focus is goals of the Millennium Declaration.
China	✓			Peace keeping, habitat, HIV/AIDS, children, racism, small arms, follow up to Millennium Declaration falls far short of expectations, terrorism (9/11), UN has to redouble efforts to address poverty, goals of Millennium Declaration, conference on financing for development, sustainable development, ODA, debt relief, Africa will struggle to achieve goals, China support for and commitment to helping Africa will continue, China pledges to forgive 10 billion RMD Yuan of its external debt.
Philippines	✓	✓		All goals of Road Map important and mutually reinforcing, issues in Millennium Declaration need to be addressed simultaneously, flexibility important, peace and security, drug trafficking, money laundering, conflict prevention, weapons mass destruction, small arms, conference on

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				financing for development, debt relief, globalization-uneven progress, need for social safety nets along with globalization, violence against women, GA should be central to choosing annual themes for development
Poland	✓	✓		Road Map useful in helping member states choose priorities, Millennium Declaration strong and visible milestone on common road towards prosperity, world leaders spoken in Millennium Declaration, shared responsibility, practical implementation important, strengthening rule of law (terrorism), eradication of poverty, human rights, democracy and good governance, all goals important, Millennium Declaration must be implemented as a whole, unlikely to reach poverty goal is a worry, debt relief important, good governance, democracy, rule of law, transparency, implementation of Millennium Declaration must continue to the principal goal.
United States of America	✓	✓	✓	Millennium Summit addresses challenges of humanity, reaffirm US commitment to Millennium Declaration, importance of focus on goal of combating terrorism, 9/11, conflict, conflict prevention and resolution, democracy, HIV/AIDS, TB, Malaria, combatting poverty and sustainable development, economic growth to combat poverty, governments responsible, donors, Africa, investment in Africa, partnership with private sector NGOs corporations, higher education private individuals, IMF World Bank debt HIPC initiative twenty four nations signed up, Road Map contains useful ideas but countries must devise own procedures for addressing the issues, look forward to member states consideration of newly proposed MDGs and indicators ( <i>ed's note: reads as prompt to criticise it</i> ), importance of international community working together for common cause.
Republic of Korea	✓	✓	✓	Thanks to Sec Gen and Michael Doyle for the Road Map, Road Map first step, Annex enhances document, political will has subsided since Millennium Declaration, concerted efforts required, 9/11, terrorism, multilateralism, reporting system for discussion by GA, basically agree to seven areas highlighted, peace and security emphasise prevention, strengthening



Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				UN especially GA, curb missile proliferation-weapons mass destruction, mines, ODA, private sector and civil society.
Czech Republic	✓	✓		Goals from Millennium Declaration, almost empty GA Hall this morning, themes from global summits, coordination is the key, sustainable development, 9/11, terrorism, combine combating terrorism with long term broad strategies of millennium summit, must focus on both terrorism and longer term strategies which will build spirit of multilateralism, conflict prevention, poverty eradication, peace building, demining, democracy, human rights, environment, goals of millennium summit.
Japan	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration, Road Map, Terrorism, humanitarian assistance, Afghanistan rehabilitation and reconstruction, middle east worrisome, demands for peacekeeping, HIV/AIDS, Kyoto protocol, sustainable development, health, combatting conflict and poverty in Africa, partnership for Africa's development, sexual exploitation of children, terrorism, human dignity, Security Council reform, 9/11, terrorism, ECOSOC, Bretton Woods, WTO, goals of Millennium Declaration.
Indonesia	✓	✓		Road Map assist in deliberations, 9/11, terrorism, range of challenges outlined in Millennium Declaration now compelling for comprehensive path to peace, Road Map as compliment to agreements of 1990's and Millennium Declaration, sustainable development, agreements already in place a priority, conflict prevention, poverty eradication, country defined, summit sustainable development, national policies important, good governance, concrete action, democracy-challenge to ensure it works for all people, security council reform, resources for development- not other priorities.
Mexico	✓	✓		Road Map comprehensive, contribution of various policy actors, objectives are from 1990's docs, problems closely intertwined, 9/11, terrorism, need for unity between developed and developing countries, seven areas of Road Map, political will and commitment, economic growth, Monterrey, handicapped persons rights.
Thailand	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration, 56 goals, 9/11,

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				terrorism, but still need to address all priorities of Millennium Declaration, human security, range of priorities, poverty, crime, conferences, peace and security, rehabilitation and reconstruction, weapons mass destruction.
Bangladesh	✓	✓	✓	Support draft resolution, fundamental values and principles, Millennium Summit, various themes of Millennium Declaration, Road Map gratitude for, resourcing, environment, HIV/AIDS, WTO, integration of MDGs with national goals, social services, financial and technical assistance, peacekeeping reform, weapons mass destruction, terrorism, 8 MDGs and targets.
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	✓	✓		Charter- freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature, shared responsibility, Millennium Declaration, issue of some parties considering some priorities more important than others- must maintain fine balance, agreements of 1990's, terrorism, 9/11, nuclear terrorism, international rule of law, various themes of Millennium Declaration, obviously fight against terrorism important but must keep goals of Millennium Declaration on the agenda, comprehensive and effective remedies, Monterrey, importance of all goals, Millennium Declaration to become driving force of the United Nations itself.
Colombia	✓	✓		Thanks for Road Map, Millennium Summit- issues important, various issues of Millennium Declaration, peace, 9/11, terrorism, drug trafficking, money laundering, need to ensure that globalization benefits all people of the world, humanizing globalization, eradicating absolute poverty, multilateral open equitable trading system, peace, justice, bringing perpetrators to justice, international criminal court, HIV/AIDS, importance of translation to action, better future for all humankind.
Brazil	✓	✓	✓	Thanks for Road Map, 9/11, need to ensure that 9/11 does not overshadow priorities of Millennium Declaration, Road Map useful tool, creative vision for role of UN, compliment 8 MDGs and associated targets, political will, welcome proposal to include indicators, periodic evaluations, youth employment, partners, private sector, fight poverty, cooperation,

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				solidarity.
Argentina	✓	✓		Road Map a reliable programme, peace, human rights, development, urgency, 9/11, terrorism, peace keeping, weapons mass destruction, nuclear weapons elimination, mines, international law court, interdependence human security and development, HIV/AIDS, special needs of Africa, environment, democracy, strengthening UN, eradication of poverty, sustainable development.
Tunisia	✓	✓		Millennium Declaration agreed priorities, 9/11, terrorism, peace and international security, weapons of mass destruction, development and poverty eradication, private capital and ODA, 1994-1999 ODA decreased by 10 Billion but string of ambitious agreements for development at same time, protection of vulnerable groups, various goals of Millennium Declaration, solidarity, annual reports.
Morocco	✓	✓		Thanks for Road Map, strengthening UN by reforming it, Security Council reform- little progress made, work of GA renewed by commitment to concrete action, international law, ECOSOC review, synergy between various UN bodies required, private sector, globalization- need for equity, 9/11, terrorism.
Israel	✓			Millennium Declaration, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, vision for freedom, peace and prosperity for all people, eliminating poverty, disease, environmental degradation, armed conflict, HIV/AIDS, Africa, NEPAD, cooperation with Africa, developing country, Israel's expertise in various matters such as irrigation, desert agriculture, water management, food security, 9/11, terrorism, freedom from fear, reject all attempts to justify murder of innocent civilians, unprecedented possibility and tremendous challenge.
Nauru	✓	✓		Cooperation, collective vision, endorse Road Map, pacific island forum, weapons of mass destruction, governance main issue of their country and surrounding countries, basic education, disease, HIV/AIDS, malaria, TB dengue fever.
Pakistan	✓	✓		Faith in UN Charter, Millennium Declaration new hope, 9/11 terrorism, Road Map dwells upon issues in the Millennium Declaration,

Country	Ref. to Millennium Summit/ Millennium Declaration	Ref. to Road Map	Ref. to Annex	Themes
				replacing culture of reaction with that of prevention is important, various conflicts- look at causes, Kashmir, nuclear capabilities- balance required, Pakistan- ravages of conflict for over 2 decades, international community must give attention to the underlying causes of extremism an terrorism, increase ODA required, Monterrey, managing globalization, injustice third world, democratization, special needs of Africa, HIV/ AIDS, ODA, private market, UN- need to be more democratic transparent accountable effective, root causes of conflict.
Kazakhstan	✓	✓		Compliment Road Map, new millennium new challenges, terrorism, Afghanistan, more peaceful stable environmentally safe world, strengthening role of UN.
Cameroon	✓	✓		Support Millennium Declaration, ambitious goals set in Millennium Declaration, Road Map compliment, translate words into deeds, conference for least developed countries 14 to 20 May 2001 inclusion of duty and quota free access to markets debt alleviation mobilization of external financing, environment, slum dwellers, 9/11 terrorism, international court of justice, strengthening African capacities, Security Council, HIV/AIDS, special needs Africa, various themes of the Millennium Summit including elimination of poverty, sustainable development, debt cancellation, improved access to markets, ODA, FDI, transfer of technology, need for action- making the Road Map a reality.
Venezuela	✓	✓		Road Map- gratitude for, Millennium Declaration- various themes, UNGA responsible for following up themes of Millennium Summit, 9/11, HIV/AIDS, human rights, democracy, good governance, financing for development, sustainable development, Security Council reform, strengthen UN.
Switzerland (Observer status at UN)	✓	✓		9/11, global approach, coherent strategy, dealing simultaneously with multiple problems, Road Map action oriented, equitable development leads to peace, operationalise strategies, goals of millennium summit, political will, strengthen UN, partnerships civil society and private sector, reports from Secretary General important, indicators.

## Appendix 7: Justification of indicator ratings

Hypothesis one			
	Indicators	Rating	Justification
1.	<i>MDG2 selection based on a broad or synoptic view of the information available to policy actors.</i>	Yes and No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - UNMD synopsis of 1990's agreements.</li> <li>• 1990's agreements based on conferences with experts in the field.</li> <li>• No - group selecting 8MDGs for <i>Road Map Annex</i> did not do rational, unbiased and comprehensive analysis of global challenges and opportunities.</li> </ul>
3	<i>Policy process was collective action of individuals, groups, organisations and nation-states.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parallel process for <i>Road Map Annex</i> selection was not collective action.</li> </ul>
4	<i>Clear, time bound targets, transferred into action.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDGs have clear time bound targets. (This study did not attempt to establish the degree of transfer into action).</li> </ul>
6	<i>Universal primary education as part of a successful tradition of goal setting and accountability structures that deliver progress.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence in Jolly et al (2009) of successful UN processes.</li> <li>• Universal primary education UN priority since 1948.</li> </ul>
7	<i>Purposeful action on the part of development professionals with relevant expertise.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both <i>UNMD</i> and <i>Road Map</i> developed by experts in the field.</li> </ul>

8	<i>Policy actors using rational, empirically grounded scientific understanding and data, unbiased, complex and full analysis.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synopsis of 1990's agreements by John Ruggie for <i>UNMD</i> but in practice <i>UNMD</i> did not become the policy.</li> </ul>
9	<i>Legitimate, transparent, accountable decision making.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy actors "sneaking priorities" in an annex, "Conniving with OECD", being influenced by the World Bank.</li> <li>• Misleading accounts of policy process by UN and UN Secretariat.</li> </ul>
10	<i>Addressing poverty as persistent and central policy concern.</i>	Yes/No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - policy texts have consistent focus on addressing poverty.</li> <li>• No - there was a disjuncture between interviewee accounts and policy texts.</li> <li>• No - MDG origins in initiatives to strengthen and focus the UN.</li> <li>• No - Evidence of multiple/co-existing motivations.</li> </ul>

Hypothesis two			
	Indicators	Rating	Justification
1.	<i>Undemocratic, complex and opaque policy process.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elite policy actors establishing parallel processes.</li> <li>• Sneaking priorities into annex.</li> <li>• Excluding most priorities of <i>UNMD</i>.</li> </ul>
2.	<i>Policy process largely irrational but presented as rational.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN websites and authors such as Annan (2012) present process as based on rational synoptic paradigm. But real MDG process (<i>Annex</i>) had mixed decision policy process paradigms.</li> </ul>
3.	<i>Downward revision of goals and targets set in the Education for All process (Jomtien, Dakar).</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst MDG2 (and MDG 3) were narrower, no evidence that policy actors undertook a downward revision.</li> <li>• No evidence that EFA priorities were considered for the <i>UNMD</i> or <i>Road Map Annex</i>.</li> </ul>
4.	<i>Evidence that resources were purposefully diverted away from secondary and higher education.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence in policy process of resources purposefully diverted away from secondary and higher.</li> </ul>
5.	<i>Gradual erosion of pro developing country policy priorities.</i>	Yes and No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes- many priorities aimed at addressing structural issues were excluded from the MDGs.</li> <li>• No- MDGs individually were in the interests of developing countries, it is</li> </ul>

			just that the combination of MDG priorities established a policy architecture that was possibly less effective because goals aimed at structural issues were excluded.
6.	<i>Policy decisions serving developed country and private sector interests.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear trend in 'Group 2' texts toward neo-liberal, new public management and private sector interests.</li> <li>• 'Group 2' texts dominate the process.</li> <li>• <i>Investing in development</i> (2005) emphasises private sector interests.</li> </ul>
7.	<i>Relatively stable and shared pro developed country priorities by dominant policy actors.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of shared policy priorities by dominant policy actors.</li> <li>• Even elite policy actors deciding the MDGs disagreed with each other.</li> </ul>
8.	<i>Claiming world-opinion and pro poor to justify decisions and conceal other interests and motivations.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UN resolutions of 1997 and 1998 show a motivation for MDGs was strengthening and focussing the UN.</li> <li>• MDGs also served career prospects of development professionals with all sorts of experts brought in (Hayley).</li> </ul>
9.	<i>Policy decisions made by dominant policy actors without evidence that decisions reflect world opinion.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDGS not voted on by GA as stand alone list.</li> <li>• MDGs determined by elite policy actors.</li> </ul>
10.	<i>Developing countries have little or no say in MDG2 selection.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence of developing country voice in MDG selection, other than consultation regarding MDG8 with G77 leadership.</li> </ul>



11.	<i>Policy process driven by self-maintaining bureaucracy of elite policy actors/ development professionals, who ensure an expansion of the scale of UN activities.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear evidence that development professionals controlled the process to select MDGs (Annex).</li> <li>• All at the table for selecting MDGs were development professionals.</li> </ul>
12.	<i>Unequal power relationships reproduce themselves in the policy process.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviewees repeatedly expressing concern over dominance of the 'economic side'.</li> <li>• Both social democratic and neo-liberal priorities included in UNMD, but neo-liberal paradigm prevails.</li> </ul>
13.	<i>Policy reinforcing existing global ruling hegemony including neo-liberal priorities such as market fundamentalism of self-regulating markets dis-embedded from the social context and new public management.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of these priorities in <i>Investing in Development</i> and final form of MDGs.</li> <li>• No consideration of local context in MDG target setting.</li> </ul>
14.	<i>Education used to pave the way for private sector interests.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear articulation in policy process of good governance, infrastructure and education as paving the way for private sector interests.</li> </ul>

Hypothesis three			
	Indicators	Rating	Justification
1.	<i>Policy actors used a rational policy process, or at least the appearance of a rational process.</i>	Yes and No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - for General Assembly UNMD process.</li> <li>• Yes – way in which process was presented to the general public.</li> <li>• Yes –policy actors for annex used rational capacities and weighed pros and cons of options.</li> <li>• No – no rational justification or evidence of synoptic oversight in deciding inclusions/ exclusions.</li> </ul>
2.	<i>Policy values, norms and practices are those of Western modernity, including progress, justice and associated ideas of the state and the individual. Strong influence of neo-liberal priorities to justify the policy.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CDA showed clear alignment of ‘Group 2’ policy texts with Western modernity.</li> <li>• Policy actors did not question value of setting goals, targets and measuring progress.</li> </ul>
3.	<i>UN as taken for granted forum for global policy decisions.</i>	Yes and No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes - UN taken for granted as forum through which MDGs should be selected.</li> <li>• No – Elite policy actors set up parallel process in belief that normal GA process would lead to yet another ambitious agreement followed by little, if any, achievement.</li> </ul>

4.	<i>The presence of coercive, mimetic and normative isomorphism.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coercive – policy actors say the ‘economic side’ strongly influenced priorities. Policy actors interviewed expressed concern at this.</li> <li>• Mimetic and normative isomorphism evident in prominence of Western neo-liberal policy paradigm, without evidence that any particular group or policy actor made this happen.</li> <li>• Policy priorities gradually aligning with neo-liberal paradigm through the process.</li> </ul>
5.	<i>A taken for granted-ness and remarkable consensus about universal primary education as a policy priority by decisions makers. Therefore a common sense choice without evidence of rational consideration of alternatives.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 5 minutes of discussion about universal primary education as policy priority by elite policy actors.</li> <li>• Interviews demonstrate that this is a widely taken for granted policy priority amongst development professionals.</li> </ul>
6.	<i>Few alternative policy priorities in the field apart from universal primary education, as seen by dominant policy actors. Therefore strong likelihood of the priority surviving the policy process.</i>	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other educational priorities were also present in the process, such as MDG3.</li> <li>• Text- <i>Investing in Development</i> gives equal attention to all levels of education.</li> <li>• UN General Assembly in 2005 emphasised importance of various levels of education.</li> </ul>

7.	<i>Little or no consideration of remarkably different economic, political and cultural circumstances between nation-states.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDGs and associated targets did not take into account local context. For example MDG2 takes no account of starting point in developing country, so uneven expectations about degree of progress in 15-year period.</li> </ul>
8.	<i>Professionalization of the field. Similar academic credentials and backgrounds of powerful policy actors. Therefore isomorphism of policy views, approaches and outcomes and crucial role of development professionals as policy elite determining policy outcomes.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shared background and assumptions of elite policy actors.</li> <li>• Remarkable consensus around universal primary education.</li> </ul>
9.	<i>Uncritical acceptance of policy priorities that may be contradictory.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-existence of MDG7 (environmental sustainability) and MDG8 (global partnership for development) illustrate this point.</li> </ul>
10.	<i>UN as perpetuator and subject of widely accepted world society culture, reflective of Western hegemony.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDGs captured public imagination.</li> <li>• Elite policy actors realised they had something of value that would appeal to the public and would trigger action.</li> <li>• CDA revealed trend toward Western hegemony.</li> </ul>
11.	<i>A world-wide, macro-phenomenological view of policy priorities.</i>	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MDGs were global goals without consideration of local context.</li> </ul>

## **Appendix 8: Key ethical issues encountered in the study**

### **Issue 1: Respecting the rights of interviewees and elite policy actors alongside the rights of those who MDG2 claimed to help.**

The purpose of the case study was transformative, aiming to contribute to our understanding of the policy process and thereby help improve it. The study had its foundations in critical theory and critical realism in particular, justifiably subjecting the policy process and policy actors to critique, in a constructive sense. The ethical approach was based on the British Educational Research Association Guidelines (2011).

The MDG's were addressing serious human rights issues on a global scale. Those suffering from poverty lack adequate food, water, sanitation, medical care and education. Alarming sickness and mortality rates are a reminder of the desperate situation (Pogge 2010). In the year 2000, over 1 billion people lived on less than \$1.00 per day (Annan 2012). Even now, the number of people living on less than \$1.25 per day is estimated at 836 million (United Nations 2015c). There are important questions around structural issues such as the global distribution of power, global policies and practices, either causing poverty or at least allowing it to continue. In the case of the MDGs, the policy inclusions and exclusions had intended material affects, aiming to make some outcomes more likely and others less likely. Elimination of crippling debt, for example, was excluded from the MDGs by elite policy actors, even though world leaders had agreed to it at the Millennium Summit. This opens the possibility that policy actors knowingly allowed certain priorities agreed to in the *Millennium Declaration* to be excluded and thereby perpetuated a status quo that might itself be a root cause of poverty.

Whilst the rights of those whom the MDGs claimed to help was at the foundations of the study, at the same time the rights of elite policy actors, many of whom agreed to be interviewed, had to be respected also. This led to an ongoing dilemma of trying to protect the rights of those that the MDGs claimed to help, as well as protecting the rights of interviewees. Through various iterations of the study the findings and recommendations

changed, sometimes deeply grounded in the rights of the poor (with the unfortunate consequence of associated moralistic comments), sometimes identifying with elite policy actors and the dilemmas and contradictions they worked in the midst of.

This ethical issue was managed as follows:

1. Respecting interviewee rights

There was an ethic of respect for persons involved in the research as interviewees and policy actors in the MDG2 policy process. People were treated fairly, with dignity, respect and free from prejudice. The purpose of the study was made clear to interviewees and they gave voluntary informed consent prior to the interview. Participants were guaranteed that their comments would not be attributed to them if they did not wish. They had the right to withdraw from the interview at any time, and were given an advanced draft of this dissertation for comment prior to submission. Adjustments to this dissertation were made based on their feedback.

2. Respecting the right to anonymity

In the original study design interviewees could choose anonymous participation or not. Some chose to participate anonymously, some not. When writing up the study I took the decision to make all participation anonymous. In this way a reader could not deduce who was who by a process of elimination.

3. Handwritten interview notes rather than recording

In the original design, interviews were to be recorded. However I took the decision to take handwritten notes rather than record interviews. This protected interviewee rights also. If there was controversy following publication of this study, there was no recording of what people had said.

4. Avoiding tantalising scoops that could have harmed reputations

Some interview comments were quite sensational and would have made good headlines. These revealed actions by elite policy actors that were at odds with the moral and ethical claims of the MDGs. Such tantalising scoops were not included in the write up of this

study. Rather, a range of data were used to show general patterns of decision making and to raise the issue in a more general sense. By this process the same findings and conclusions were reached.

#### 5. Constructive criticism

Public policies and organisations are and should be open to critique, for the purpose of transformation and improvement. Interviewees used constructive criticism regarding the policy process. They reflected on their own involvement, on other's involvement and showed commitment to poverty reduction. If policy actors themselves applied constructive criticism to the MDG process, and their part in it, I saw it as reasonable that this study would do the same.

#### 6. Not acting as a voice for or on behalf of the poor

Recognising that I am similar to elite policy actors in income, educational background and perspective was an important part of keeping balance in this study.

#### 7. Taking a preferential option for those whom MDG2 was claiming to help

People living in poverty, who had little or no say at all in MDG2's selection, are deserving of dignity and respect. Given that the MDGs called on the global community to 'end poverty now', the rights of people living in poverty were not compromised for fear of critiquing the policy process or policy actors. Part of the ethical approach was to say what needed to be said and to critique aspects of the process that appeared to be more in the interests of elite policy actors and/or the global elite. An example includes the gradual erosion of priorities aiming to address structural causes of poverty and preference for strategies that did not challenge those structures. Tracing the historical process, coding, CDA and interview data all pointed to this. Given the scale of suffering the policy was supposed to address, including this was ethical, even though elite policy actors may be uncomfortable with it. One elite policy actor, on reading a draft of this thesis, said "I feel a little guilty". Such awareness may be a starting point for transformation.

## **Issue 2: An ethic of responsible scholarship**

Being careful, thorough and systematic was an important ethical consideration. Whatever the outcome, the research should be reliable. I owed serious scholarship to everybody.

Components included:

1. The rigours and discipline of movement from theory to hypothesis, to hypothesis testing and back to theory
2. Thorough and careful analysis of a range of data
3. Use of various analysis tools such as a chronological record of events, relationships map, coding and tracing of themes and CDA
4. Interviews
5. Coming up carefully from data and mapping themes
6. Writing various iterations of the thesis
7. Improving the thesis as a result of feedback from advisors and interviewees
8. Reading examples of good scholarship

There were times during the research process that it was not possible to foresee what the findings would be or to what extent the hypotheses were valid. I was open to what would emerge. This showed that I kept bias in check and that the various methods employed forced me to consider the data and findings from various perspectives.

Taking such a thorough and responsible approach was time consuming. But if this study contributes to the literature, it needs to be reliable and its findings defensible.



Form submitted to Ethics Committee:

## **University of Bath Department of Education**

### **EdD PROGRAMME: ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS OF PROPOSED RESEARCH**

**To be completed by the student and supervisor(s), and approved by the Director of Studies for the EdD before any data collection takes place**

#### **Introduction**

1. Name(s) of researcher(s)

Edmond Maher

2. Provisional title of your research

*How and why* universal primary education come to be selected over other priorities identified in the UN Millennium Declaration

3. Justification of Research

Policies have effects. Global policies, such as the UN Millennium Project, have global effects and are important. This research aims to explore the priorities of those who were driving policy during the process of selecting the Millennium Development Goals.

#### **Consent**

4. Who are the main participants in your research (interviewees, respondents, raconteurs and so forth)?

I will be seeking to interview those involved in committees and organisations that determined the selection of 8 Millennium Development Goals from the 56 originally included in the UN Millennium Declaration. The key participants were development professionals from the UN Secretariat, UNESCO, The World Bank and the IMF.

5. How will you find and contact these participants?

Professor Hugh Lauder has indicated that he can get me in contact with 2 people that were involved during this time. Also I have another contact who works in education at UNESCO in Paris. She has said she will assist in access to key personnel. Otherwise I will make contact myself and try to gain access.

6. How will you obtain consent? From whom?

I will give a consent form to all interviewees, outlining the purpose of my research as well as provisions for guaranteeing confidentiality and integrity. Included on that form will be a question exploring if consent from anyone other than themselves is required before interviewing.

### **Deception**

7. How will you present the purpose of your research? Do you foresee any problems including presenting yourself as the researcher?

The purpose of my research will be presented exactly as it is. I foresee no problems in presenting myself as the researcher. I have no vested interests in the outcomes of the research and do not work for any of the concerned organisations.

8. In what ways might your research cause harm (physical or psychological distress or discomfort) to yourself or others? What will you do to minimise this?

I will ensure confidentiality for interviewees if they so wish. Also if the findings may cause harm to any person or organisation involved I will first discuss the issue with the person/organisation and impose an embargo on the thesis for a least a 5 year period if necessary.

### **Confidentiality**

9. What measures are in place to safeguard the identity of participants and locations?

Interviewees will be given the option of being interviewed confidentially and having their identities safeguarded if they so wish. Also off the record comments are off the record, such comments will not be recorded in interview transcripts, and will remain strictly between myself and the interviewee.

**Accuracy**

10. How will you record information faithfully and accurately?

Interviews will be recorded and transcribed by me. Interviewees will have the option of reading and amending the interview transcript if they so wish. The true record of the interview is the one amended by the participant.

11. At what stages of your research, and in what ways will participants be involved?

Interviewees will be involved in the data gathering stage in interviews and checking transcripts. Then, if there is a potentially harmful finding, prior to submitting the thesis, I will involve them again to see if an embargo is required.

12. Have you considered how to share your findings with participants and how to thank them for their participation?

I will present participants with a summary of my findings and a copy of my thesis (provided there is no embargo on it). Also a letter of thanks and name mentioned in the acknowledgements sections of the thesis, with their permission.

**Additional Information**

13. Have you approached any other body or organisation for permission to conduct this research?

No

14. Who will supervise this research?

1<sup>st</sup> Supervisor: Dr. Manuel Souto-Otero, 2<sup>nd</sup> Supervisor, Prof. Hugh Lauder.

15. Any other relevant information.

No.

<b>Student:</b>	<b>Signature:</b>  <b>Date:</b>
<b>Supervising Member(s) of Staff:</b>	<b>Signature(s):</b>  <b>Date:</b>
<b>Director of Studies for EdD</b>	<b>Signature:</b>  <b>Date:</b>

***A copy of this form to be placed in [1] the student file, and [2] an Ethics Approval File held by the Director of Studies for EdD Research Students. The Director of Studies (EdD) will report annually to the Department's Research Students Committee (white paper business) on ethical issues of particular interest that have been raised during the year.***